Winter 1999

Perceptions of Georgia Public Secondary School Principals and Counselors Regarding Counseling Program Tasks

Dorothy Frances Hall Hardy

PERCEPTIONS OF GEORGIA PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND COUNSELORS REGARDING COUNSELING PROGRAM TASKS

Dorothy Frances Hall Hardy

PERCEPTIONS OF GEORGIA PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND COUNSELORS REGARDING COUNSELING PROGRAM TASKS

A Dissertation

Presented to

the College of Graduate Studies of

Georgia Southern University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

in

Educational Administration

---

by

Dorothy Frances Hall Hardy

December 1999

December 19, 1999

To the Graduate School:

This dissertation entitled "Perceptions of Georgia Public Secondary School Principals and Counselors Regarding Counseling Program Tasks " and written by Dorothy Frances Hall Hardy is presented to the College of Graduate Studies of Georgia Southern University. I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education with a major in Educational Administration.

Supervising Committee Chair

We have reviewed this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Fred M. Page, Jr

Department Chair

Accepted for the College of Graduate Studies:

Dean, College of Graduate Studies

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation in memory of my father, Francis Langston (Spec) Hall. Throughout his life he always showed his love for and support of me. He gave me a firm foundation upon which to build my life.

I also dedicate this dissertation in honor of my mother, Dorothy Boyum Hall Bush; my husband, Sidney Collier Hardy; and my sons, Stephen Graham Hardy and Andrew Langston Hardy. Your encouragement, optimism, and sacrifices provided a constant source of motivation for me. Without your love and support, I would not have been successful in completion of this degree.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During my course of study for the Doctor of Education degree in Educational Administration, numerous individuals gave me support, encouragement, expertise, and friendship. Their individual and combined efforts assisted me in fulfilling the requirement for the attainment of this degree.

I offer my thanks and my appreciation to Dr. Ron Davison and Dr. Harbison Pool for their instruction and their assistance. Dr. Jim Bergin helped me to strengthen my literature review by suggesting counseling resources. His participation as a field reviewer for the American School Counselor Association as the national standards were developed made him an expert resource. My doctoral supervising committee assisted me with problems and concerns and offered suggestions for the improvement of my research project. Dr. Fred Page offered constructive criticism from the viewpoint of a professional in a field outside of administrative leadership. Dr. T.C. Chan provided stability and consistency to my committee and served as an expert in the area of educational leadership. Dr. Cordelia Douzenis served as my methodologist. As I worked with her through each step of my research project, I became more and more enlightened into the possibilities of this study. She was invaluable to me in following this study to completion. I offer my thanks to each of these individuals.

The high standards expected for success in this doctoral program began at our orientation, carried directly into the first course, and continued throughout the last required course. The standard-bearer for the excellence required for this program was

Dr. Michael Richardson. Your care, your concern, and your inspiration gave me the fortitude necessary to see this dissertation through to completion. Thank you, Dr. Richardson, for taking over the chairmanship of my committee. In my time of need, you stepped in with little background of my study and you gave me the guidance needed to finalize this project. Your leadership was exemplary and my appreciation to you is most sincere.

I would also like to acknowledge my friend and co-worker, Mrs. Sharon Staples, for the time and effort she gave to provide me with suggestions for editorial improvement of this dissertation. My final acknowledgements go to the members of our co-hort class. We shared experiences, we bonded, and we became friends. Thanks to each of you. I offer special thanks to my two partners, Dr. Marie C. Hooks and Dr. Catherine C. Wooddy. Marie (Curly Joe) initiated this venture and Cathy (Larry) kept us on task. You made the journey bearable and I thank you.

VITA

Dorothy Frances Hall Hardy was born and raised in Dublin, Georgia. She completed her high school education at Dublin High School. She graduated from Georgia Baptist Hospital School of Nursing in 1966 and is licensed as a registered professional nurse in Georgia. She received a Bachelor of Science degree in Art from Georgia College in 1971 and a Master of Education in Counselor Education from Georgia Southern College in 1978. She completed requirements through Georgia Southern University for the specialist certification in leadership with the Georgia Department of Education in 1998. In 1999, she graduated from Georgia Southern University with a Doctor of Education Degree in Educational Administration.

For five years, Mrs. Hardy worked as a registered professional nurse in hospitals in Marietta, Ga.; Athens, Ga.; and Dublin, Ga. In 1971, she began teaching art at Dublin High School and Dublin Junior High School. From 1981 to the present, Mrs. Hardy has been employed as a counselor at Dublin High School. Mrs. Hardy is a member of the Professional Association of Georgia Educators, the Georgia School Counselor Association, and the American School Counselor Association.

ABSTRACT

PERCEPTIONS OF GEORGIA PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND COUNSELORS REGARDING COUNSELING PROGRAM TASKS

DECEMBER 1999

DOROTHY FRANCES HALL HARDY

B. S. GEORGIA COLLEGE

M. Ed. GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE

Ed. D. GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Directed by: Professor Michael D. Richardson

The purpose of this research was to determine if the perceptions of public secondary school principals and counselors differed as to actual and desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. The counseling program tasks used for this study were specified in Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs, a publication of the American School Counselor Association.

Two survey instruments were developed using the appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. Section I consisted of Likert scales for responses to actual and desired involvement in each task area. Section II asked for demographic data. This section was slightly different on the counselors' and the principals' versions of the instrument. The surveys were mailed to 264 public secondary school principals in Georgia and to 650 public secondary school counselors in Georgia.

Results from this study indicated that most often principals assigned tasks to counselors. Actual involvement responses and desired involvement responses of principals and counselors to appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks showed significant differences in some areas. In the task areas showing significant differences between principals' and counselors' ratings of actual involvement in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks, mean ratings for counselors were higher than for principals. In the areas showing significant differences between the desired involvement ratings of principals and counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks, mean ratings for principals were higher than counselors.

The findings from this study concluded that both secondary school principals and counselors perceived counselors to actually be involved in inappropriate counseling program tasks, as well as in appropriate counseling programs tasks. Both principals and counselors desired involvement in appropriate counseling program tasks. Conversely, the results of this study indicated that while principals desired involvement of counselors in inappropriate counseling program tasks, counselors themselves did not desire involvement in inappropriate counseling program tasks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents (continued)

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table of Contents (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

General Introduction

Professional school counselors are expected to be many things to many people. To students, counselors are advisors, mentors, friends, confidants, therapists, and occasionally, surrogate parents. To teachers and administrators, counselors are consultants, coordinators, problem solvers, experts in human growth and development, facilitators, and collaborators. To parents, counselors are advisors and confidants. To communities, counselors provide links that make classroom learning relevant to daily life and the world of work. Counselors are expected to be competent, caring, and committed professionals with the shared goals of assisting students in reaching their full potential. However, when assigned time-consuming tasks not related to comprehensive developmental counseling roles, the valuable skills counselors possess are often misused or underutilized (Ballard, 1995; Cassese, 1969; Cole, 1991; Coy, 1991; Harlan, 1980; Henry, 1989; Miller, 1998; Murray, 1995; O'Dell, Rak, Chermonte, Hamlin, & Waina, 1996; Oshiro, 1980; Ripley, 1996; Schalesky, 1993; Thomas & Hutchinson, 1992).

Traditionally, secondary school counselors have performed both clerical and administrative tasks in addition to, or even in place of, counseling roles (Hentsch, 1996). Time spent performing these noncounseling tasks prevents secondary school counselors from rendering counseling services that would be of great benefit to their schools and, more importantly, to their students (Thomas & Hutchinson, 1992). Counselors' duties and tasks have "multiplied and the guidance counselor seems to be involved with, or even

in charge of, nearly every aspect of school operation" (Murray, 1995, p. 5). Not only is inappropriate use of counselors' time detrimental to counseling programs, it is also financially costly (Dwyer, 1979; Goodnough, 1995).

Historical Development of Guidance and Counseling

The first appearance of school guidance programs was in the late 1800s. The thrust of these early guidance programs was vocational assistance. Guidance programs were also directive, promoting both socially appropriate behaviors and character development (Paisley & Borders, 1995). In 1907, the principal of Grand Rapids High School in Michigan included vocational and social guidance in the English curriculum of his school (Ballard, 1995). In the 1920s, guidance and counseling primarily assisted students with occupational selection and placement. In the 1930s, school counseling consisted of three main components: educational services, vocational services, and personal-social services. The roles of the school counselor in delivering these services were emphasized rather than the program of services rendered (Campbell & Dahir, 1997).

Over time, school guidance and counseling services emerged to meet social, educational, political, and economic trends (Paisley & Borders, 1995). The evolution of school counseling was influenced by individuals such as Carl Rogers, Frank Parsons, and Gilbert Wrenn. Today, school counseling programs focus less on vocational and educational decision-making and more on personal growth and development. This shift in focus created a change in emphasis from the roles counselors perform to the guidance and counseling programs and services offered by schools (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Paisley & Borders, 1995). Today's guidance and counseling programs in schools seek to meet the special needs of today's students (Topor, 1997).

Counseling in the 21st Century

Students of today are different from students of the past, as societies of today and tomorrow are immensely different from past societies (Ballard, 1995; Banks, 1994; Harlan, 1980; Hentsch, 1996; Miller, 1998; Topor, 1997). To provide society with young adults competently prepared to enter the work force, fundamental changes must be made in today's educational system (Murphy, 1993). Ross and Bailey (1994) pointed out that schools have remained virtually unchanged for over 100 years.

For schools to meet the needs of students in the 21st century, careful examination and evaluation of the current school organization is needed. In planning and implementing a restructured organization, all shareholders must be involved. Polite (1993) examined leadership as a "shared phenomenon" (p. 2). She emphasized that autocratic leadership must be discontinued with more emphasis on teacher empowerment, participatory decision-making, and shared power.

Counseling programs that seek to provide academic, career, personal, and social assistance to the youth in our secondary schools are essential to this change. Among the many goals of counseling, the most important are to "promote personal growth and to prepare students to become literate and motivated workers, caring family members, and responsible citizens" (Coy, 1991, p. 15). Students are faced not only with educational and career challenges, but also with personal and social problems. Secondary school counselors, whose traditional jobs include guidance for programs of study and postsecondary planning, are now an essential part of most students' lives. Coy concluded that counseling programs for today and tomorrow need to be both preventative and developmental.

O'Bryant (1991) listed five major foundations upon which school counseling programs should be built: they should complement instruction; they should promote the complete educational system; they should provide developmental, preventive, and remedial assistance; they should include multifaceted components that address many areas of need; and, they should assist students in recognizing and reaching their individual potential. In the 21st century, school counselors will be essential in preparing students to meet the expectations of higher academic standards in order to become productive and contributing members of society (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). To assist counseling professionals and school principals in this task, the American School Counselor Association has defined roles for secondary school counselors in the American educational system by "establishing similar goals, expectations, support systems and experiences for all students as a result of participation in a school counseling program" (Campbell & Dahir, 1997, p. ii).

Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs is representative of the American School Counselor Association's vision and commitment to initiate positive changes in school counseling programs. The association's goals are to help students achieve educationally and to be prepared for the challenges of the 21st century (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). Although Dahir (1997) acknowledged that problems faced by school counseling programs since their beginning would not be solved by national standards, she did conclude that they could become a "powerful statement of what students should know and be able to do as a result of participating in a school counseling program" (p. 139).

Standards for Counseling Programs

For many years, the profession of school counseling had no clearly delineated standards for school counseling programs. Working without well-defined standards for their profession, secondary school counselors did not have a foundation for supporting and promoting comprehensive developmental counseling programs (Dahir, 1997; Topor, 1997). Because there were no national and few state standards, school principals were able to assign clerical and administrative duties to secondary counselors without knowingly undermining basic elements of counseling programs (Topor, 1997).

Due to variance of role expectations among the states, consensus regarding counselors' roles was difficult to obtain (Johnson, 1989). Therefore, state standards, if they did exist, were as varied as the states themselves. Some states did exert an effort to standardize practices for good counseling programs and developed their own prescriptions for school counseling programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). Dahir (1997) maintained that, "The nature of the work of school counselors and the design of school counseling programs continues to vary significantly across localities, states, and the nation" (p. 25).

In 1979, the American School Counselor Association established a position statement for school counseling programs. Even though this effort was made, unification of standards remained elusive. In 1997, the American School Counselor Association published Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs. These national standards, representing fifty years of work, were designed to be a "living document" committed to providing "positive changes in school counseling programs" (Campbell & Dahir, 1997, p. ii).

In 1990, the state of Georgia implemented an evaluation program for school counselors. The Georgia School Counselor Evaluation Program (GSCEP) was developed to standardize across the state job expectations for school counselors (Anderson, 1994). GSCEP, through four broad task categories with measurable dimensions, was used to evaluate counselor performance. The goal of GSCEP was to improve guidance and counseling services for students in Georgia public schools (Georgia Department of Education, 1991). Through this instrument, job expectations for school counselors were defined (Anderson, 1994).

American secondary schools need comprehensive developmental counseling programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Georgia Department of Education, 1991). Hensch (1996) maintains that a "comprehensive skills-based counseling program de-emphasizes administrative and clerical tasks" (p. 24). Living in a complex world of rapidly changing social conditions, today's high school students have multifaceted problems. Demographic shifts in populations are producing students who are vastly different from students of the past (Robbins, 1993). In his definition of the purpose of public education, Robbins notes the importance of reaching a broad spectrum of intellectual and social needs of children, youth, and adults. Comprehensive developmental counseling programs are based on the need areas of academic, career, and personal/social principles (Dahir, 1997).

Interactions between Principals and Counselors

In addressing educational qualities necessary to prepare students for the 21st century, Paul (1994) asserted that, "A good principal is at the heart of a successful school" (p. 43). Cole (1991) also noted that, "The efficiency and the effectiveness of the school counselor's role is due in large part to the attitude of and support from the school

administrators" (p. 11). She acknowledged that it was realistic for principals and counselors to share some roles within the school. Considering the diversity of roles performed by both principals and counselors and the inadequate preparation of principals to supervise secondary school counselors, counselor involvement to determine their roles and to develop guidance and counseling programs has potential for improving counseling programs (Henderson, 1994). Hentsch (1996) noted that principals needed "educational updating" (p. 37), and after being updated, counselors and principals should "renegotiate role clarification" (p. 37) for counselors.

In an Ohio project, leadership teams composed of one counselor, one administrator, and one other professional educator, were effective in developing counseling models that divided services into four areas: counseling, classroom instruction, consulting, and coordinating (O'Dell et al., 1996). The models developed by the leadership teams incorporated developmental, preventive, and remedial approaches to school counseling programs.

Principals' roles, just as counselors' roles, are many and include supervision of curriculum and instruction, staff development, staff evaluation, coordination of special programs, and others (Henry, 1989). Because of the many varied tasks performed by principals, Henry stated that the supervision of counselors is secondary to other primary responsibilities. O'Dell et al. (1996) noted lack of leadership on the part of principals as one of four major problem areas for school counseling.

Thomas and Hutchinson (1992) considered principals to be the most influential determinants of roles for counselors. They maintained that principals were usually the framers of schools' philosophies and the setters of schools' goals. Depending on

principals' preferences, counselors' duties may include administrative tasks which allow little time for meeting the counseling needs of students.

The philosophies and goals of secondary schools can be enhanced by counseling programs that have been designed and implemented by the special skills of the counselors (Coy, 1991). Coy further observed that, "The effectiveness of the school counseling program is greatly influenced by the leadership of the principal. A supportive principal can ensure the success of such a program" (p. 19).

Supervision of Counselors

Henderson (1994) noted that for children of today to manage the complicated situations in which they live, highly skilled and knowledgeable counselors are needed. Counselors need focused and constructive supervision. Growth and enhanced effectiveness are the purposes of supervision. Competent supervision strengthens the quality of counselors' skills and promotes professional judgment. Henderson questioned whether secondary school principals were knowledgeable enough of clinical functions to supervise secondary school counselors competently. She proposed the use of counselors' peers and counselor educators to train school principals in supervision of counselors.

Secondary school principals can be instrumental in developing, with their counselors, counseling programs that meet the needs of their students. Principals are responsible for assigning duties to school personnel and as such determine counselors' job descriptions. Principals who assign counselors tasks that adhere to the older, traditional role expectations limit counselors' abilities to provide comprehensive developmental counseling programs. Therefore, principals are ultimately instrumental in determining the type and quality of guidance and counseling programs in their schools (Cassese, 1969;

Cole, 1991; Frank, 1986; Hentsch, 1996; O'Dell et al., 1996; Oshiro, 1980; Paul, 1994; Polite, 1993; Thomas & Hutchinson, 1992).

Role Confusion

A major element in the secondary school program is that of counseling (Henry, 1989). Counseling is a pupil personnel service. Harlan (1980) noted that because the complexity of schools is greater than ever before, specialized services are required to meet educational goals. He acknowledged that some disagreement exists concerning appropriate organizations for pupil personnel services, but he asserted that there is agreement on the need for leadership to optimize the roles of pupil personnel professionals.

Cassese (1969) acknowledged confusion over the roles of counselors, stating that counselors were frequently caught between what they were supposed to do, what they wanted to do, and what their principals expected them to do. Oshiro (1980) determined that major professional problems for counselors were related to expanding and conflicting roles. In a 1986 study, Frank found considerable variation for several counseling responsibilities based on principals' perceptions of counselors. He noted that high school principals ranked as major roles for counselors those of educational advising, scheduling and placement, planned sequential interventions, and career guidance. In this same study, he found that secondary school counselors preferred roles that involved less educational advisement, less scheduling and placement, less orientation and registration, and less work with student records and information. Counselors wanted more time for planned sequential interventions through individual, small group counseling, and classroom guidance sessions. They also cited career guidance, working with teachers in facilitating

student acclimation to learning, parent education, and consultation with parents as some of the services needed. Hentsch (1996) supported the need for educating principals in proper role assignment for counselors.

According to Cole (1991), there are times when counselors believe that principals assign them duties that are not within the counseling realm. Conversely, principals sometimes view counselors as nonteam players who are not willing to perform duties that no one else seems trained to do. Cole summarized her comparisons of counselor roles to administrator roles by stating that "the efficiency and the effectiveness" of the school counselors' roles are determined greatly by the "attitude and support" of school principals (p. 11).

Thomas and Hutchinson (1992) observed that school counselors frequently performed administrative tasks. They found these tasks contributed to the inadequate use of counselors' skills and thus prevented counselors from adequately meeting the primary needs of students. They identified the lack of role definition as a major problem for counselors.

Participative Leadership

O'Dell et al. (1996) studied counseling roles and identified four problem areas for school counseling programs: (1) role confusion, (2) lack of organization for service delivery, (3) public misunderstanding of school counseling programs, and (4) lack of leadership for program development. In the area of role conflict, the authors noted that school administrators and boards of education, rather than counseling professionals, have been defining counseling roles. In addressing the lack of leadership for program

development, the authors concluded that counselors have little to say about the organization of counseling programs.

Involving followers in the decision-making process is a characteristic of participative leadership. Yukl (1998) stated that participative leadership is "concerned with power sharing and empowerment of followers" (p. 9). Northouse (1997) maintained that when leaders include subordinates in their decision-making, they are practicing participative leadership. He described a participative leader as one who consults with followers, acquires ideas and opinions from them, and unites their advice into the decisions. With their presentation for the restructuring of the guidance delivery system, Greer and Richardson (1992) reported that "counselors and administrators must work together as a team and support each other" (p.95).

The principal, as counselor supervisor, is critical to effective and efficient secondary school counseling programs (Hentsch, 1996). Principals can make or break a secondary school counseling program. O'Bryant (1991) stated, "Without question, to be a successful principal is to be an empowering principal" (p. 4). Oshiro (1980) mentioned the use of head counselors in some schools. Head counselors are included as members of administrative teams. Some responsibilities of head counselors include working with principals in implementing and supervising the guidance programs of schools. Empowered secondary school counselors are able to determine their roles best and to develop a counseling plan that delivers services to help students educationally, developmentally, socially, and personally (Boley, 1994).

Literature reviewed for this study suggested the use of counselor empowerment in role determination (Boley, 1994). Daft (1995) defined empowerment as "power sharing,

the delegation of power or authority to subordinates in the organization. It means giving power to others in the organization so they can act more freely to accomplish their jobs" (p. 411). Because secondary school counseling programs should optimize the entire educational programs of the school and because counselors have the know-how to develop and implement these programs, administrators should restructure leadership and empower counselors.

Statement of the Problem

Counseling programs are critical in secondary schools today (Coy, 1991). Both secondary school counselors and secondary school principals are accountable for the development and implementation of counseling programs that meet the needs of their students (Henry, 1989). In Georgia, the implementation of the Georgia School Counselor Evaluation Program (1991) provided secondary school principals with a framework for evaluating both individual counselors and the total school guidance and counseling program. With the 1997 publication of the national standards for school counseling by The American School Counselor Association, a national benchmark for "essential elements of a quality and effective school counseling program" (Campbell & Dahir, 1997, p. 3) was established. These national standards, developed after an extensive research project, provide guidelines for creating comprehensive developmental counseling programs that seek to meet the needs of students who live in today's complex society and prepare them for the next century.

Secondary school principals determine the roles that counselors play by assigning tasks to counselors and by evaluating counselors (Anderson, 1994). The assignment of secondary school counselors' roles are usually determined by what the principal views as

important for the school (Miller, 1998). Principals are usually the immediate supervisors of counselors and are important for supporting the entire guidance and counseling program in their schools (Hentsch, 1996). However, the roles assigned to counselors may be incompatible with the development of a comprehensive developmental guidance program. This present study is designed to examine the actual and desired involvement of Georgia public secondary counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school principals and counselors.

Research Questions

The major question guiding this study was: Do the perceptions of public secondary school principals and counselors in Georgia differ as to actual and desired involvements in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as specified by the American School Counselor Association?

The research questions addressed in this study were:

1. What are the actual involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school principals in Georgia?
2. What are the actual involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school counselors in Georgia?
3. What are the desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school principals in Georgia?
4. What are the desired involvements of secondary school counselors in

appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school counselors in Georgia?

5. Are there differences in the actual and desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school principals?
6. Are there differences in the actual and desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school counselors?
7. Are there differences in counselors' and principals' perceptions of actual involvements in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks?
8. Are there differences in counselors' and principals' perceptions of desired involvements in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks?

Importance of the Study

In an early study at the University of Chicago, Haskew (1934) investigated the status of guidance in high schools in Georgia. In this study, he found principals and homeroom advisors serving as "guidance functionaries" (p. 54). Educational guidance and work quality were the primary guidance objectives of principals, while homeroom advisors addressed discipline and social conduct. In summarizing this study, Haskew found guidance practices in Georgia high schools showed "little evidence of centralized planning" (p. 54).

Thirty years after the study by Haskew (1934), Shumake (1964) conducted a study on the roles of secondary school counselors in Georgia. He began his study, "As a profession, school counseling is in its infancy" (p. 1). He proposed that as counseling

changed and grew, the need to clarify roles and functions of school counselors also increased. Now, another thirty years have passed. Counseling is no longer an infant profession, but roles continue to need clarification (Stallings, 1991; Thompson, 1986). This study is important because current research adds to the knowledge base begun in Georgia by Haskew and Shumake.

Research literature supports the fact that counseling wields major influences in secondary education (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Dahir, 1997; Hentsch, 1996; Topor, 1997). Literature also substantiates that school principals are the most influential molders of the counseling programs in their schools (O'Bryant, 1991). Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs provides guidelines for developing comprehensive developmental counseling programs in schools (Campbell & Dahir, 1997).

Professionally, counselors and principals must be accountable for high-quality programs in their schools (Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999). This proposed study is important for counselors and principals who want to provide counseling programs that meet the needs of their students. Counseling programs should be preventive, remedial, and developmental. Because secondary school principals often assign inappropriate tasks to counselors, counseling programs that benefit students may not be provided. By obtaining from secondary school principals and counselors information regarding the actual involvement of counselors in both appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks and by also knowing their desired involvements in these tasks, the results of this study should help both principals and counselors develop guidance and counseling programs that meet the needs of students in their schools. The study provides secondary

school counselors with research data to use in advocating comprehensive, developmental guidance and counseling programs for their schools.

Results from this survey of appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks, as presented in Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs published by the American School Counselor Association (Campbell & Dahir, 1997), provides research data in an area that, at the time of this study, was non-existent. The data gathered provides a researched base of appropriate and inappropriate counseling program task perceptions, actual and desired, of secondary school counselors. This data should benefit counselor and administrator preparation programs. The ultimate benefactors of this study are the students who are served by comprehensive, developmental guidance and counseling programs.

Procedures

This research project was a quantitative descriptive study of the perceptions of secondary school principals and counselors in public schools in Georgia regarding the desired and actual involvement of secondary school counselors in 22 appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. Principals and counselors in secondary schools listed by the Georgia Department of Education as special entity schools and secondary schools in school systems requiring prior approval for research were not included in the populations for this study. With these eliminations, 264 principals of secondary schools and 650 secondary school counselors in the state of Georgia (M. Fleming, personal communication, April 7, 1999) made up the two populations.

Packets of survey information were mailed to all principals and included cover letters, survey instruments, and self-addressed stamped return envelopes for both

principals and counselors in each secondary school. The cover letters for both the principals and the counselors explained the research study, gave explanations for completing the survey instrument, and apprized the participants of coding which was used for tracking purposes only. The cover letters for principals instructed them to give each counselor in their schools one of the counselor survey packs which included a cover letter, the survey instrument, and a return envelope.

The survey instrument contained two parts. The first part contained Likert scales for actual involvement and desired involvement of counselors in 22 appropriate and inappropriate task areas as noted in the American School Counselor Association's publication, Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). The second part of the survey instrument asked for demographic information.

The major research question that guided this study involved differences in perceptions of secondary school principals and counselors toward actual and desired involvements in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. Other questions sought to determine what tasks, appropriate and inappropriate, were actually performed by counselors and what involvement was desired by counselors and principals in the same tasks.

The initial data analysis involved calculation of percentages of actual and desired involvements for each Likert scale rating in each task area as reported by both principals and counselors. Means and standard deviations were used to calculate the average level of actual and desired involvements and the variability for each task item as reported by principals and counselors. A series of independent t tests were performed to compare the

perceptions of counselors and principals on each task item. A series of dependent t tests was performed to compare actual and desired involvements on each task item from within the perspectives of the counselors and from within the perspectives of the principals.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in conducting this study:

1. Public secondary school counselors in the state of Georgia are assigned inappropriate counseling program tasks.
2. Public secondary school principals in the state of Georgia assign inappropriate counseling program tasks to counselors.
3. Appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as presented in Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs by the American School Counselor Association are tasks performed by many secondary school counselors.

Limitations

This study was restricted by the following limitations:

1. Demographic variables could have affected the outcomes of this study.
2. Knowledge of the American School Counselor Association's national standards could have biased the responses of the respondents.
3. The survey was based on a limited listing of appropriate and inappropriate school counseling program tasks
4. This study was limited to the state of Georgia. Results from this one state study may not be generalizable to the entire country.

5. This study did not examine roles of elementary or middle school counselors.

Definitions of Terms

Counseling: "The interaction between a counselor and students either individually or in small groups. Counseling goes beyond information-giving to helping students consider issues in their lives that are of concern, that hamper their performance in school, or that affect their behaviors towards others in their school environment. Counseling is confidential and should not be observed as part of an evaluation" (Georgia Department of Education, 1991).

Functions: Tasks performed by school counselors.

Guidance: "The type of interaction between a counselor and a student or students in a group or in a classroom that focuses on normal developmental issues and school-based processes" (Georgia Department of Education, 1991).

Georgia Public Secondary Schools: All schools serving some configuration of grades 8-12 that are supported by funds from the state of Georgia and local communities (Georgia Department of Education, 1999).

Planned Sequential Intervention: "The provision of individual and group counseling services for students with normal developmental concerns and for those who are experiencing problems, which includes the counselor's contacts with appropriate others as well as the participating student" (Frank, 1986, p.8).

Roles: Areas of responsibility for secondary school counselors.

Secondary School Counselor: A person holding Georgia state certification for counseling in public secondary schools.

Secondary School Principal: A person holding Georgia state certification for leadership in public secondary schools.

Special Entities: "Facilities that house students for all or part of the instructional day but do no report these students from that facility for state funding through FTE" (S. Gandy, personal communication, April 7, 1999). Secondary schools that may be considered special entities are evening high schools, special education centers, psycho educational centers, psycho educational satellites, alternative schools, adult education schools, private schools, regional libraries, and other schools.

Tasks: Activities performed by secondary school counselors to complete role assignments.

Summary

From information cited in the literature, counselor roles are multifaceted and usually dependent upon principal assignment. Also noted are the demands on schools to meet the needs of students living in our constantly changing society. It is essential that secondary schools of the future utilize the special knowledge and expert skills of counselors to help students. Although counselors are now armed with national and state professional standards, secondary school counseling programs remain governed by secondary school principals. Therefore, principals are essential to the development and implementation of guidance programs in their schools. Principals, working with their counselors, can design guidance programs that meet the needs of their students, their schools, and their communities.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Today's high school students experience many problems. In addition to the traditional, developmental challenges that confront youth, secondary school students also encounter the multifaceted, complex problems of today's society. These expanded problems are often obstacles in their developmental and educational lives. High school students of today and tomorrow have needs with broader bases and longer reaches than students before them (Ballard, 1995; Hentsch, 1996, Ripley, 1996; Stallings, 1991; Topor, 1997).

Secondary school counseling is important to the total school program (Boley, 1994; Coy, 1999; Dahir, 1997; Gorton & Ohlemacher, 1987; Guerra, 1998; Henry, 1989; Thomas & Hutchinson, 1992; Thompson, 1986). The educational and personal development of students is positively influenced by counseling interventions (Gerler, 1992). In their studies, Cassese (1969), Dwyer (1979), Henry (1989), and Topor (1997) referred to the unclear roles of school counselors. "To meet the needs of children in today's complex and troubled society, school counselors must be clear and aggressive in defining their roles and functions" (Ballard, 1995, p. ix). The lack of clarity in role definitions for secondary school counselors may be attributed to tasks assigned to secondary school counselors (Cassese, 1969; Dwyer, 1979; Henry, 1989; Johnson, 1989; Oshiro, 1980; Reichert, 1974; Stalling, 1991; Stevenson, 1990; Thompson, 1986; Topor, 1997). "The principals' involvement in identifying and clarifying the role of counselors is

critical" (Stevenson, 1990, p.6). A major concern for secondary school counselors is their inability to set their own roles and perform the tasks required to fulfill their roles. Borders and Paisley (1995) noted,

> Perhaps the most overriding issue for the school counseling specialty, is the lack of control school counselors have over their day-to-day work activities and the development of their profession. The school counselor's role continues to be either explicitly or implicitly defined (if not dictated) by a number of sources, few of whom have any background or experience in school counseling and who often provide somewhat contradictory direction. School counselors, for example, are directly accountable to school principals and the school system's director of school counseling. Unfortunately, many times these individuals do not have a counseling background. If that is the case, these two noncounseling "supervisors" may have very different agendas about the counselor's role in a school (p. 4).

Literature topics reviewed for this chapter included the historical development of secondary school guidance and counseling, as well as services needed in the 21st century. Literature relating to roles, functions, or tasks performed by secondary school counselors was examined for inclusion. Literature relating to state and national standards for school guidance and counseling programs, interactions between secondary school principals and secondary school counselors, and supervision and evaluation of secondary school counselors was evaluated for use in this chapter.

Historical Development of Guidance and Counseling

Guidance and Counseling in Infancy

Secondary school guidance and counseling has grown from a profession in its infancy (Hentsch, 1996; Shumake, 1964) into a profession with visions and goals for the new millennium (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). Coy (1999), Paisley and Borders (1995), and Topor (1997) dated the beginning of secondary school guidance and counseling to the late 1880s. Others specified 1907 as the year Jesse B. Davis, a principal of Grand Rapids High School in Michigan, first implemented guidance in high schools (Ballard, 1995; Dwyer, 1979; Harlan, 1907; Herndon, 19990; Topor, 1997). Davis realized the needs of high school students for vocational planning and incorporated vocational guidance into English classes (Ballard, 1995).

The efforts initiated by Davis were continued by Frank Parsons. In 1909, Parsons formed the Vocation Bureau of the Civic Service House in Boston, Massachusetts. The purpose of this organization was to provide vocational guidance to students who had dropped out of high school and sought employment. Parsons' method of vocational guidance was to unite job requirements with individuals' abilities, aptitudes, and interests. Later, this method of vocational guidance was called Trait and Factor Theory. Personal and social aspects of students' behaviors were not considered (Topor, 1997). As a result of his work in this area, Parsons is often called the "Father of Guidance" (Ballard, 1995; Coy, 1999; Stevenson, 1990; Topor, 1997).

The early history of school guidance and counseling authenticates that the original role expectation for secondary school counselors was in the area of vocational guidance (Dahir, 1997; Stalling, 1991). Paisley and Borders (1995) noted that in addition to

vocational assistance, the early guidance and counseling programs sought to develop character and teach acceptable social behaviors. Similarly, Coy (1999) stated that early counselors focused on the moral and vocational aspects of guidance. According to Topor (1997), the early guidance movement was not supported theoretically, but was intuitive and basically logical.

Growth of Guidance

Paisley and Borders (1995) recognized the important part federal legislation played in the advancement of guidance and counseling programs. The Smith Hughes Act of 1917 and the George Reed Act of 1920 advanced school guidance by providing financial reimbursement for vocational guidance programs (Topor, 1997). The George-Barden Act of 1946 provided federal funding for school guidance and counseling (Dahir, 1997 & Topor, 1998). Guidance programs in secondary schools were supported by the United States Office of Education which collected data and assisted the states in developing and expanding their vocational services (Topor, 1997).

Guidance ceased to grow and develop during World War I and the Great Depression (Dwyer, 1979; Topor, 1998). Conversely, these two historical events increased students' needs for vocational assistance (Dahir, 1997; Topor, 1997). Assessment of personality traits and aptitude were integral parts of vocational guidance. There was an even greater need for assessment measures during and after the Great Depression (Coy, 1999).

In the 1930s, educational and personal/social services were included with vocational services offered by school guidance programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Lawton, 1998). Counselor roles, rather than programs and services offered, were

emphasized during this time (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). It was also during this time period that vocational guidance expanded to include counseling (Dahir, 1997). Dwyer (1979) maintained that the "reverse order development" of guidance was responsible for role and task conflicts (p.4). The federal funding made counselor education programs more accessible for students (Guerra, 1998). Counselors were assigned to schools and their roles and tasks were questioned later (Dwyer, 1979).

Counseling Included in Guidance Programs

In the 1940s, counseling became a recognized counterpart of guidance when Carl Rogers introduced client-centered theory. According to Stanciak (1995), Rogers' book, On Becoming A Person, changed counselors' roles. Stevenson (1990) attributed counselor role changes to another Rogers' book, Counseling and Psychotherapy. As a result of Rogers' influence, counseling became a primary task of school guidance and counseling programs (Thompson, 1986). Guidance and counseling needs were seen from a developmental point of view (Coy, 1999).

The Soviet launching of Sputnik in 1957 was a pivotal point in education in the United States (Topor, 1997), causing American citizens to become concerned with academic achievement. It was also the launching of Sputnik that led to the rapid growth of guidance and counseling (Myrick, 1997). The National Defense Education Act of 1958 greatly expanded guidance and counseling services in schools (Ballard, 1995; Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Dahir, 1997; Dwyer, 1979; Harlan, 1980; Lawton, 1998; Paisley & Borders, 1995; Topor, 1997). This legislation provided funding for the education of secondary school counselors, for program development, and for testing procedures to validate academic achievement (Topor, 1997). The National Defense Education Act of 1958

"gave impetus to the development of guidance services in public schools" (Dwyer, 1979, p. 4). Counselors' major roles were advising students in taking more math and science courses and preparing students for college (Coy, 1999). According to Lawton (1998), counselor roles also included assisting students with personal problems that might prevent them from achieving desired academic success. Myrick (1997) called this bill "the single most important event in the history of the school counseling profession" (p. 6).

In the 1950s, certification standards were developed and implemented by some states in efforts to standardize course work required by counselor preparation programs. Emphasis on standardizing certification continued in the sixties and in the seventies. In 1978, the Association of College Educators and Supervisors formed the Committee on Accreditation for the purpose of improving counselor preparation programs. This committee was functional until the creation of the Council of Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (Coy, 1999).

Developmental Guidance and Counseling

The Counselor in a Changing World was published by Gilbert Wrenn in 1962. Wrenn's book promoted individual and group developmental counseling as well as consultation to parents (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Myrick, 1997). Lawton (1998) noted that counseling in the 1960s had the primary goal of assisting the overall development of individual students, counseling in the 1970s re-emphasized career education, and counseling in the 1980s was defined by state requirements and guidance counselors became school counselors. Many guidance and counseling programs of the 1950s and 1960s were implemented without defined counselor roles (Dwyer, 1979). Although guidance and counseling in the 1970s was more accountable, Dwyer pointed out that the

complicated development of the profession prevented agreement of roles and tasks. In the 1980s, regulations set by the states led to more clearly established definitions of counselor roles and tasks (Campbell & Dahir, 1997).

The national standards for school counseling programs as proposed by the American School Counselor Association currently provide the structure for comprehensive developmental guidance and counseling programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). Myrick (1997) wrote, "Developmental guidance and counseling assumes that human nature moves individuals sequentially and positively toward self-enhancement" (p. 27). Myrick also noted that to achieve the goals of comprehensive developmental counseling programs, all school personnel must be involved and roles for all must be identified.

Changing Needs of Students

"School counseling has a history of evolution and change" (Terrill, 1990, p. 84). From the earliest programs of vocational guidance, counseling has evolved to include not only career guidance, but also developmental counseling. Noting the expectations for counselors in the late 1990s, Miller (1998) listed personal and academic counseling in addition to college and career counseling responsibilities. He urged schools and professional organizations to "emphasize that society has changed drastically since the 1950s" (p. 37). Students are extremely influenced by the changing world in which they live (Ballard, 1995).

The Children's Defense Fund (1998) provides data about American life. The circumstances under which many of the students in today's school live are listed by this organization (Appendix A). Schools must meet the needs of these children. "The

comprehensive developmental school counseling programs should be an integral component of the total school program because its purpose is to address the needs of all students" (Coy, 1999, p. 6). Ballard (1995) agreed that comprehensive development counseling programs would help all students.

Myrick (1997) wrote of the new emergence of counseling in today's world. Myrick pointed out the revitalization of career development counseling. He emphasized the need for "prevention and early intervention" (p. 8). Myrick also stressed the importance of counselors becoming globally conscious so they could help prepare young people of today to become effective citizens in our multi-cultural, global society.

Descriptions of Guidance and Counseling

Distinguishing Guidance from Counseling

Thompson (1986) suggested that the words, guidance and counseling, rebut one another. Guidance, as an administrative role, is affiliated with the school as an entity; while counseling, a therapeutic role, is individual student oriented. The words communicate multiple meanings and interpretations. Thompson compared counseling, "technique and process," with guidance, "objectives and content" (p. 41-42).

Although used interchangeably for more than fifty years, guidance and counseling are independent of each other and offer different services to students (Myrick, 1997). Confusion over services offered under each entity attributed to inconsistencies in principals' perceptions of counselors' roles (Dahir, 1997). Historically, guidance was considered the "umbrella" that covered multiple services "aimed at personal and career development and school adjustment" (Myrick, 1997, p. 2). "Guidance was described as an instructional process or structured learning activities in which children develop a

greater understanding of themselves and others" (Dahir, 1997, p. 23). Thompson (1986) noted that counseling was not identical to guidance. She defined counseling as, "A method or technique applied to individuals or groups to enhance their personal development and psychological competencies. Counseling involves a dynamic relationship between the counselor and the counselee" (p. 24). Myrick (1997) also supported counseling as the development of personal relationships and interactions with students.

Negative Aspects of Guidance

Because guidance is an ambiguous term and can be performed by many members of the school faculty and staff, it adds confusion to the roles and tasks of secondary school counselors (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). Patterson (1971) suggested eliminating the term guidance, stating that guidance activities were diverse and took time away from counselors' primary role of counseling. He maintained that counseling was the primary task of school counselors. Campbell and Dahir (1997) stated that guidance was the act of providing information and advising.

Positive Aspects of Counseling

Hoyt (1993) reported on a study conducted at the 1989 American School Counselor Association Leadership Conference. Data from a survey given to 124 members of the organization's leadership team concluded that the term counseling was preferred over guidance by the leaders participating in the study. Hoyt pointed out that when the American School Counselor Association began in 1952, guidance dominated with counseling as tasks performed under guidance. He noted that today the positions of guidance and counseling were reversed. Myrick (1997) noted that distinctions between

guidance and counseling are "arbitrary and sometimes difficult to defend in practice" and making the distinction "may not even be necessary" (p. 5).

Importance of Guidance and Counseling in the School

Benefits for Principals

"Good guidance permeates the school environment. Where specific guidance and counseling programs are present, there is also better school morale among students and teachers. There is a positiveness that can be experienced throughout the school" (Myrick, 1997, p. 42). Myrick presented ways in which school counselors benefit principals and ultimately, the school. According to Myrick, counselors provide these benefits by assuming leadership roles in developing comprehensive developmental guidance and counseling programs that meet the needs of their students.

The job of a school principal is "a mammoth, all-encompassing task" (Cole, 1991, p. 6). Cole explained that principals, using good organizational techniques, can enlist the expert skills of school counselors to promote a positive learning environment. Goodnough (1995) noted that counselors possess the skills to provide important services to the school. His study implied that principals have high expectations of counselor performance and that these high expectations were predictive of the time counselors were involved in professional tasks.

Comprehensive developmental school counseling programs provide positive services to all customers of the school. Campbell and Dahir (1997) listed four benefits of comprehensive developmental guidance and counseling programs to administrators:

1. Integrates school counseling with academic mission of the school.
2. Provides program structure with specific content.

3. Assists administration to use school counselors effectively to enhance learning and development for all students.
4. Provides a means of evaluating school counseling programs (p.14).

Selection of School Personnel

Although selection and evaluation of school personnel is an administrative task, Cole (1991) suggested that principals consult with counselors for possible input relevant to the employment or evaluation of personnel. Cole noted that counselors often receive both positive and negative from students and parents about teachers. She emphasized that principals must also realize that counselors have ethical and confidential considerations before sharing information.

A study by Beale (1995) examined the manner in which principals selected counselors for employment. As the most important individuals in the selection of counselors, principals' criteria for choosing counselors were considered consequential to counselor educators, school systems, and counselors. Personal interviews, character references, recommendations from former employers, and grades on internships were determined to be the four most significant of the 15 items listed on the survey instrument. The data from this study also indicated that school counselors were not often involved in the selection of their colleagues, yet the selection of counselors was considered to have significant impact on the quality of counseling programs.

Importance of Principal and Counselor Relationship

"Administrator relationships are especially important because the ambiance of the workplace is greatly influenced by those at the upper leadership levels" (Miller, 1998, p. 40). This quotation and those that follow were garnered from the secondary school

counselors across the nation who participated in the survey conducted by the National Association for College Admission Counseling. Similar expressions from secondary school counselors reported by Miller (1998) were, "The quality and effectiveness of school counseling services is very often directly linked to the person who serves as school principal or superintendent" and "Without the school administrator's clear support, there is a strong likelihood that the counseling program will suffer" (p. 40).

In a study on the revitalization of counselors' roles, O'Dell et al. (1996) noted the importance of leadership and charged that counselors must work closely with administrators. In an earlier study, Dwyer (1979) suggested that solutions to some educational problems would be well served by teams of counselors and principals. Henry (1989) studied the relationships between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals. In summarizing the importance of her study she wrote:

> It is clear that the need to examine the principal's interpersonal behavior in relationship to the secondary school counselor is crucial to the quality, productivity, effectiveness and efficiency of the counselors. The principal's responsibility to the structure of the educational organization and consideration for the counselors is important to his/her role and function as a principal. (p. 7, 8)

Because principals are usually the immediate supervisors of school counselors and work closely with counselors, they are a major source of support for counseling programs (Hentsch, 1996). Hentsch noted the need for improved communication between principals and counselors. In a study of secondary school counselors in Virginia, Goodnough (1995) found a need for improved communication between counselors and principals for task assignments to counselors.

Teamwork and Shared Roles

In comparing the roles of administrators and counselors, Cole (1991) stated that counselors occasionally felt they were assigned tasks inappropriate to the roles they should be performing as school counselors. She also noted that administrators considered counselors to be non-team players at times. Cole discussed roles for counselors, roles for administrators, and shared roles. By sharing roles, Cole (1991) noted that teamwork using the combined special skills of both counselors and principals should be used to reach common goals. By working closely together and sharing responsibilities, school counselors and principals "make schools successful learning places" (Kaplan, 1995, p. 261). Greer and Richardson (1992) also noted the importance of teamwork and support between counselors and principals.

Murray (1995) urged counselors to initiate program development meetings with principals. She pointed out that both principals and counselors were teachers, and as teachers they should collaborate to provide services to meet the needs of the students they serve. All educators must work together to provide appropriate educational opportunities for students (O'Bryant, 1991). O'Bryant charged secondary school principals to collaborate with counselors in forming and implementing comprehensive developmental guidance and counseling programs as integral elements of the total educational program. Good principal-counselor relationships strengthen the overall educational programs of schools (Huey, 1987). These positive relationships put students and other stakeholders in winning situations.

Task Assignments

Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity

Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell (1968) indicated roles were of utmost importance to organizations. They described roles as being defined by duties, or "role expectations" (p. 61). Coll and Freeman (1997) defined role conflict as, "The sense of being pushed and pulled between conflicting messages from various role senders" (p. 253). Secondary roles considered appropriate by school counselors are often inconsistent with roles desired by administrators, students, and parents (Stalling, 1991). Role ambiguity exists when roles are not clearly defined (Thompson, 1986). When roles are not clear, conflict often results. Situations resulting from conflicts are those of "no-win" (Stevenson, 1990, p. 25). Yukl (1998) reported that role clarification involved communication that was intended to guide and coordinate tasks.

Using the Role Questionnaire developed by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman in 1970, Freeman and Coll (1997) conducted a study of high school counselors to investigate the research question, "What is the structure underlying role conflict and role ambiguity for a national sample of high school counselors?" (p. 33). Through analysis of responses to this question, the researchers wanted to meet two goals. These goals were to "contribute to the understanding of the measurement and structure of role conflict with high school counselors and add knowledge to the base of information on the Role Questionnaire" (Freeman & Coll, 1997, p. 33).

Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964) studied role conflict and role ambiguity. The questionnaire used by Freeman and Coll (1997) was based on theory from this study by Kahn et al. This theory states, "when the behaviors expected of an individual

are inconsistent, confusing, and conflicted, that person will experience stress, become dissatisfied, and perform less effectively than if the expectations imposed are relatively clear and consistent and do not conflict" (p. 32). The role questionnaire defined role conflict as "the competing and inconsistent expectations associated with the role" and role ambiguity as "the lack of clear, consistent information regarding responsibilities of a role and how it can best be performed" (p. 32).

Freeman and Coll (1997) summarized the literature review for their study of roles and conflicts of high school counselors into three themes. The first theme was "high school counselor positions lack clarity in prioritizing roles, accommodating new roles, and accommodating expectations from diverse groups such as teachers, administrators, and students" (p. 32). In describing the second theme, they noted that "varied duties of high school counselors reportedly conflict with one another" (p. 32). "The incongruities between preferred duties and actual duties" emerged as the third theme in their literature review (p. 33).

Historically, the roles of secondary school counselors have been unclear and confusing and have resulted from social changes (Murray, 1995). Murray also noted that school principals as well as school counselors experienced role confusion. Because of the differences in their training and education, conflict between counselors and administrators was viewed as inescapable (Cole, 1991). Kaplan (1995) considered the different paradigms in which counselors and principals work as contributors to conflicting views.

Defining Roles and Tasks

Secondary school counseling programs are essential to the entire school program, yet secondary school counselors' roles remain undefined (Thompson, 1986). Murray

(1995) stated that defining roles for counselors would remain a challenge for the future. Shumake (1964) conducted a study in Georgia on secondary school counselors' roles and tasks. In his study he referred to the changing roles of secondary school counselors and indicated that as the profession grew, the need for role and task definition also increased (Shumake, 1964). In following years, the need for role clarification for secondary school counselors continued. Ballard (1995), Cassese (1969), Dahir (1997), Dwyer (1979), Miller (1998), Murray (1995), Stalling (1991), Stevenson (1990), Thomas and Hutchinson (1992), and Topor (1997) acknowledged the role confusion experienced by secondary school counselors. They emphasized the need for definitions of roles and tasks.

Thomas and Hutchinson (1992) reported that lack of role definition was a primary concern for counselors. "To meet the needs of children in today's complex and troubled society, school counselors must be clear and aggressive in defining their roles and functions" (Ballard, 1995, p. ix). Stanciak (1995) noted the need for change in counselors' roles and tasks to meet the needs of today's students. In a national study conducted by the National Association for College Admission Counseling, survey respondents presented the need for "a clearly defined role and function for school counselors" as the most important of all issues (Miller, 1998, p. 36). This same study also put responsibility on secondary school counselors for role identification and management that would best serve the guidance and counseling needs of their students. Topor (1997) charged secondary school counselors to define their own roles and tasks. Giddings (1998) discussed five reasons that school counselors were often assigned inappropriate counseling tasks. The reasons included working without a written counseling plan, spending a majority of counseling time in therapeutic counseling, acceptance of the inappropriate

tasks willingly, failing to evaluate their professional activities, and remaining isolated from other areas of the educational program within the school.

Myrick (1997) supported four approaches to guidance and counseling. He distinguished these as crisis, remedial, preventive, and developmental. In the crisis approach, counselors intervene when critical situations arise. Remedial counseling strives to strengthen developmental weaknesses and thus possibly prevent future crisis situations. Anticipating potential problems and trying to avert their future occurrence is the aim of preventive counseling. The developmental approach to counseling incorporates the other three approaches to guidance and counseling. Interpersonal relationships are the foundation for developmental counseling. Developmental counseling helps students to learn more about themselves; their ideas, feelings, and behaviors. It helps them build skills that will help them in the learning environment and throughout life.

Principals' Influences in Determining Counselors' Roles

Administrators frequently define the roles of secondary school counselors by the tasks assigned to them (Ballard, 1995; Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999; Cassese, 1969; Coy, 1991, 1999; Goodnough, 1995; Johnson, 1989; Miller, 1998; Murray, 1995; Napierkowski & Parsons, 1995; Oshiro, 1980; Sears, 1999). Ballard (1995), acknowledging the importance of administrators in defining counselor roles, pointed out that their assignment of administrative tasks to counselors subverted desired counseling roles. According to Giddings (1998), counselors' time was often used by administrators to improve their administrative programs.

Dahir (1997) substantiated the assignments of administrative and clerical tasks to secondary school counselors. She noted that principals who did not appreciate school

counseling programs contributed to poorly defined roles for secondary school counselors. From the study on secondary school counseling by the National Association for College Admission Counseling, Miller (1998) reported that one issue of notable concern to secondary school counselors was the assignment of clerical and administrative tasks. He noted, "Clerical, administrative, and testing responsibilities assigned to school counselors received considerable attention. . . . such tasks not only limit the effectiveness of school counselors to impact the lives of students in positive ways, but also provided counselors with considerable frustration" (p. 35).

The American School Counselor Association's 1965 role statement for secondary school counselors was important for giving principals some understanding of the roles, tasks, and responsibilities of secondary school counselors (Johnson, 1989). According to Johnson, the 1977 report by the American School Counselor Association included principals as members of the guidance team. In this capacity, principals would work with counselors in defining roles. Johnson (1989) recognized the major influence principals had in defining counselors' roles. He also noted that principals did not understand the position of counselors in school systems. He summarized that while principals were primarily responsible for defining roles, counselors, because of their expertise, should also be instrumental in determining their roles (Johnson, 1989). However, as late as January, 1999 principals were still cited as being responsible for assigning "administrivia" to secondary school counselors (Sears, 1999, p. 47).

According to Murray (1995), both school counselors and principals perform roles and tasks that are closely related to the other. She attributed to some extent the lack of role clarification for secondary school counselors to these co-mingled tasks and roles.

Quasi-administrative duties and acting as custodians for testing were two tasks assigned to secondary school counselors by principals (Napierkowski & Parsons, 1995). Drury (1984) noted that administrators, who might possess little knowledge of counseling, often made decisions for counseling programs. McDowell (1995) attributed unclear counseling roles to administrators who assigned school counselors administrative and clerical tasks. Stevenson (1990) introduced her study on secondary school counselors' roles with the statement, "The role of the high school counselor is not clear" (p. 1). In tracing the history of guidance and counseling, she mentioned the evolution of counseling from its modest beginning to the multifaceted profession it is today. Stevenson acknowledged the importance of principals to counseling programs and suggested that principals do not understand counseling roles. In light of their lack of understanding, principals assigned quasi-administrative and clerical tasks to high school counselors. For administrative certification, Matthay (1988) recommended the inclusion of a course in school counseling.

Ballard and Murgatroyd (1999), reiterating the works of previously cited studies, expressed the lack of role clarity for school counselors and the significant impact principals have in defining counselors' roles in their schools. Principals' attitudes and support were considered to be essential to the development and implementation of constructive and productive counseling programs (Cole, 1991). Coy (1991) described the importance of principals in defining the roles of school counselors. In 1999, Coy noted that while principals often identified counseling roles with their experiences with counselors, they were now more informed about guidance and counseling programs of today. She emphasized the importance of using counselors' knowledge for

comprehensive, developmental counseling programs and pointed out the misuse of counselor education when counselors were assigned clerical and quasi-administrative tasks.

Counselor Advocacy for Role Determination

Counselors are also responsible for the lack of clarity in their roles (Cassesse, 1969). In his study, Cassesse mentioned several earlier studies, such as Hitchcock in 1953, that pointed to the need for counselor advocacy for defining their roles and tasks. Dwyer (1979) charged counselors to determine their roles, indicating failure to do so would not establish guidance and counseling as a valuable program in secondary schools. While he related the strength of guidance programs to principals' perceptions of counseling tasks, he also attributed partial responsibility for counseling program development to counselors.

Counselors must realize that their supervisors may have little or no knowledge of counseling roles, and consequently, counselors must communicate their roles and tasks to their supervisors (Henry, 1989). Kaplan (1995) asserted that counselors could be "effective change agents with their administrators if they work in discrete and professional ways to expand the ways that principals view and respond to school events" (p. 267). Hentsch (1996) suggested that counselors were not strong enough advocates for their counseling programs. One of the recommendations resulting from the study by Hentsch was that counselors become stronger advocates for their profession in their schools, communities, and states.

Historically, school counseling services have been considered to be ancillary services (Topor, 1997). In discussing counseling reform, Burtnett (1993) observed the

omission of counseling in the publication of A Nation at Risk. He noted that this lack of public awareness was in part a fault of counselors themselves. Principals' expectations of counselors were addressed in a study by Goodnough (1995). His study indicated that, "Counselor occupational commitment and principal expectations are predictive of counselor professional task performance and that occupational commitment is predictive of principal ratings of counselor effectiveness" (p. 79). Goodnough also concluded that although counselors often were involved in non-counseling tasks, through collaboration with their principals they could work to remove the non-counseling tasks from their responsibilities.

Ballard (1995) asserted that counselors must stop waiting for others to define their roles and must start determining their own roles. In summarizing the significance of her study of school counselors' roles, Stalling (1991) pointed out that it was necessary for school counselors to define their roles if they were to be considered professionally effective. To define roles, Stalling stated that counselors must be advocates for counseling programs that meet the needs of the public they serve. Topor (1997) reiterated that counselors must be leaders in defining their roles. She noted that ancillary, non-counseling tasks contributed to the deterioration of guidance and counseling services. Boley (1994) asserted that counselors must take a leadership role in advocating for restructuring counseling services to meet the needs of the diverse student population of today.

Proactive secondary school counselors can demonstrate to administrators, parents, and students counseling activities that provide positive support for educational programs (Murray, 1995). By familiarizing themselves with the American School Counselor

Association's National Standards for School Counseling Programs and with the counselor education program requirements of the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, school counselors can advocate for comprehensive developmental guidance and counseling programs (Giddings, 1998). Napierkowski and Parsons (1995) emphasized that counselors must prove they have valuable services to provide. They referred to Raven and French's power structure model and suggested that counselors could use expert and referent powers as evidence of their abilities to contribute to the overall success of educational programs. By "assessing and using data, leading, advocating, teaming, collaborating, counseling, and coordinating" counselors are beneficial to students; documenting these benefits can provide merit for their importance in educational programs (Sears, 1999). Thomas and Hutchinson (1992) also promoted counselors being proactive in communicating their roles to administrators, parents, students, and the community. Proactive guidance and counseling was promoted by Boley (1994) as essential for counseling programs in today's schools.

Preparation Programs for Counselors and Principals

Changes in Counselor Preparation Programs

As previously noted in the historical development of guidance and counseling, role expectations for secondary school counselors changed through the years. Along with these changes, came role confusion and role ambiguity. Not only were roles poorly defined in the years after the National Defense Education Act of 1958, but college preparation programs for secondary school counselors were inadequate (Stanciak, 1995). Coy (1999) reported that the preparation programs for schools counselors changed over time. Coy also emphasized the need for school principals to know the educational

requirements for counselors. The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs requires courses from the following core areas: "human growth and development, social and cultural foundations, helping relationships, group work, career and lifestyle development, appraisal, research and program evaluation, professional orientation, and supervised experiences" (Coy, 1999, p. 6, 7).

In a survey conducted by Tennyson, Miller, Skovholt, and Williams (1989), counselors responded to a questionnaire that examined facets of their roles and tasks. One implication listed from this study was that counselor education programs should teach their students to be advocates for counseling programs, thereby defining their roles. Ballard (1995) in her study summarized as a consensus among research literature that counselors were not being prepared to develop and implement appropriate guidance and counseling programs.

National Program for the Transformation of School Counseling

Based in Washington, D. C. and founded to elevate student achievement at all grade levels, The Education Trust declared that the education of school counselors was not appropriate for meeting the needs of today's students. Working with a grant from the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, The Education Trust developed a national initiative called the National Program for the Transformation of School Counseling (Guerra, 1998). According to Sears (1999), the aim of this national initiative is "to transform the education and training of school counselors and to encourage school districts to use these newly trained counselors' skills differently" (p. 47).

Sears (1999) indicated that while counselors performed many valuable tasks, one task missing was working with students to improve achievement. She cited several

reasons that this counseling area was unattended: the assignment of "administrivia" (p. 47) to counselors by principals and counselors lack of skills in the area of student achievement. The DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund directed specific attention to the lack of academic challenge given to low-income and minority students.

In the first stage of this multi-year initiative, problems with current counselor education programs were identified. Areas identified for transformation of counselor education programs included (a) redirecting the focus to students' relationships and interactions with their school environment, (b) insuring academic equity and academic success for all students, (c) advocating opportunities for all students to reach their goals, and (d) working with all stakeholders to provide ways for students to succeed (Guerra, 1998).

Guerra (1998) asserted that counselor education programs needed to change. Sears (1999) contended that teaching counselors to assist students in academic achievement should be the primary focus of counselor education programs. Guerra (1998) listed the transformational role changes for school counselors, from present focus to the new vision (Appendix B).

In noting reactions from counselors regarding the initiative to transform counselor education programs, Guerra (1998) reported that some counselors indicated that school policies, more than counselor training prevented them from performing their tasks. Other counselors agreed that changes in counselor preparation programs were needed, but they did not agree on the severity of the problem nor on solutions (Guerra, 1998).

Changes in Counselor Education in the State of Georgia

The National Program for the Transformation of School Counseling awarded ten grants of $65,000 each to universities for the purpose of developing new models for school counseling. Of 75 applications for the grants, two universities in the state of Georgia were among the ten to receive the grants. Those schools were The University of Georgia and State University of West Georgia. The new models addressed eight factors which included selection and recruitment of students for counselor education programs; curriculum scope and sequence; methods for classroom instruction, practice, and internships; responsibilities to the profession and professional development; community relationships; partnerships between the universities and school districts; and partnerships with their individual colleges of education (Guerra, 1998).

Other universities in the state of Georgia have also made changes in their counselor education programs. Three of the universities that made changes are Albany State University, Columbus State University, and Georgia Southern University.

The counselor education program at Albany State University emphasizes developmental counseling as the foundation of its curriculum. Located in southwest Georgia, Albany State University has formed strong working relationships with public schools in its service area. "This involvement is a means of establishing school partnerships, providing public service and assuring that the developmental school counseling program at Albany State University is pedagogically responsive to the changing role of the developmental school counselor" (Wallace, 1999, p. 7).

Crutchfield (1998) noted that the counselor education program at Columbus State University prepares its students "to develop and implement comprehensive school

counseling programs which serve all students in the school, as well as parents, faculty, administration, and the community" (p. 11). This program, accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, encourages its students to be advocates with their principals and their communities for counseling programs. Students are prepared for professional counseling with an academic background grounded in theory and with clinical supervision in school settings (Crutchfield, 1998).

At Georgia Southern University, programs leading to master and specialist degrees in school counseling have been redesigned to meet accreditation requirements of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. "To provide graduates with knowledge, skills, and supervised field experiences in the organization and implementation of comprehensive, developmental school counseling programs serving public school students in grades P-12" is the goal of the revised program (Bergin, 1998, p. 6). Courses added to enhance the program of studies include:

> (a) a professionalization course which focuses on counselor advocacy and provides graduate students with a personal growth group experience; (b) a school counseling curriculum course centered on the development of curriculum content methods and materials for implementing a program based upon the National Standards for School Counseling and delineating the role of the school counselor in accordance with the Georgia School Counselor Evaluation Plan (GSCEP) and the role description of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA); (c) a course highlighting the school counselor as consultant to parents, teachers, administrators, and other professionals both within the school system and the

> community, and describing procedures for program evaluation and accountability; (d) a cross-cultural counseling course which addresses the impact of culture upon individual development and tailors counseling interventions to the needs of a multi-cultural and diverse student population (Bergin, 1998, p. 6).

In addition to these new courses, supervised clinical experience was increased to 600 hours, the counseling practicum supervision ratio was decreased and is now five to one, and counseling facilities in a new building for the College of Education will provide laboratory settings for counseling instruction.

Counselor Education for Principals

Principals do not know what counselors should be doing and therefore assign them inappropriate tasks (Henry, 1989). This lack of qualified supervision makes evaluation processes difficult. Counseling supervisors must be not only good administrators, but also knowledgeable of guidance and counseling theories and practices (Henry, 1989). Johnson (1989) credited the American School Counselor Association's 1965 role statement for secondary school counselors as being the beginning of an effort to educate principals on counselors' roles. Subsequent role statements from this national organization for school counselors revitalized the 1965 role statement, but many principals remain unaware of the tasks school counselors should perform (Johnson, 1989).

"Effective supervision comes best from those who clearly are life-long learners, who have some sense of who they are" (Cromwell, 1991, p. 11). Lampe (1985) conducted a national study of all colleges and universities that offered graduate programs in school administration and school counseling. His study sought to determine to what extent students in school administration were exposed to courses in school counseling.

Receiving a 92% national response rate, Lampe (1985) noted that many students in school administration programs did not receive adequate information regarding guidance and counseling programs. From the results of this study, Lampe (1985) made several suggestions: counselor educators could be used in school administration course work, counselor educators could conduct in-service workshops, journals of educational administration could include articles on guidance and counseling, students in school administration could attend counselor conferences, teacher course work should also include information about guidance and counseling, and counselor educators should emphasize to their school counseling students the importance of establishing positive relationships with their principals.

Henderson (1994) contended that "The primary obstacles to fully effective school counselor supervision are caused by the insufficient number of school counselor-competent supervisors" (p. 3). Supervision of school counselors is often performed by principals or other school administrators who have inadequate knowledge of counseling. In most cases, counselor supervision is administrative in nature (Roberts & Borders, 1994). Matthay (1988) suggested that principals, as the primary evaluators of counselors, should be required to include a course in counselor education in their administrative program of studies. Henderson (1994) asserted that states should require counselor supervision certification.

In a study of principals' perceptions of school counselor supervision, Ripley (1996) reported, "administrators generally lack training in the theory and practice of counselor supervision" (p. 6). Most educational administration preparation programs do not include courses in guidance and counseling (Dwyer, 1979). Hentsch (1996)

recommended from his study that principals pursue further education relating to the roles and functions of counselors. Dahir (1997) suggested that graduate schools offering educational administration programs should provide instruction in guidance and counseling to future school leaders.

School principals, or other school or system administrators, supervise school counselors (Henry, 1989). Henry also noted that a critical consideration in the supervision of counselors was the fact that school counselor supervisors usually had no training or certification in counseling. Henry quoted from a study by Bloom and Thompson, "many supervisors continue to understand the role and function of the counselor only from the administrative point of view and not from the counselor's viewpoint" (Henry, 1989, p. 32).

Standards for Guidance and Counseling

State of Georgia

Job descriptions for Georgia school counselors. Georgia public schools are required to have "written job descriptions which outline the duties and working relationships of each administrative, supervisory and student services support position" (Georgia Department of Education, 1984, p. 1). In 1982, a task force analyzed data from two earlier surveys with the goal of developing a state model of job descriptions for secondary school counselors. Acknowledging the diversity of secondary school counselors' roles, the task force established a state job description for secondary school counseling (Georgia Department of Education, 1991). This document was intended as a model for local high schools and school systems to use in developing their own

individualized job descriptions that would meet the guidance and counseling goals they had established for their guidance and counseling programs.

In a counselor role study by Stalling (1991), the Georgia State Department of Education was frequently cited for documentation of counselor role statements. Role statements attributed to the Georgia State Department of Education by Stalling included what counselors were doing but should not be doing, such as screening special education students and performing administrative/clerical tasks, and what counselors should be doing and possibly were not doing, such as curriculum related classroom guidance services. Some possible reasons for role confusion and the importance of principal and counselor relationships as noted by the Georgia Department of Education in 1984 were also referred to by Stalling.

Georgia School Counselor Evaluation Program. In 1985, the state of Georgia established The Quality Basic Education Act. Under this act, all professional school personnel certified by the state were required to have performance evaluations on a yearly basis. Following the development and implementation of evaluation instruments for teachers and administrators, the process of developing an instrument for the evaluation of school counselors began in 1987 . The Georgia School Counselor Evaluation Program was implemented during the 1990-1991 school year. In addition to the instrument's primary purpose of evaluation, the Georgia School Counselor Evaluation instrument served to identify school counselor tasks that were important for conducting effective guidance and counseling programs (Anderson, 1994; Anderson, 1995; & Georgia Department of Education, 1991).

The Georgia School Counselor Evaluation Instrument presented four task areas for schools counselors. The four task areas were further divided into dimensions and subdimensions which are measurable (Georgia Department of Education, 1991). These task areas, dimensions, and subdimensions are provided in the appendix (Appendix C).

Georgia School Counselor Association. Job descriptions for counselors in Georgia were revised in 1989, primarily in a support effort for legislation to fund elementary school counselors. This revised job description was aligned with the Georgia School Counselor Evaluation Instrument (Georgia Department of Education, 1989). In 1996, the Georgia School Counselor Association made recommendations on the needs and roles of school counselors to the state school superintendent (Bergin et al., 1996). This report to the state school superintendent addressed the roles and needs of school counselors at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels. Secondary school counseling roles and needs were listed for the areas of consultation, coordination, counseling, and developmental guidance. Listed as barriers to accomplishing these roles were assignments of non-counseling tasks in clerical and administrative areas (Bergin et al., 1996).

American School Counselor Association

National Standards for School Counseling. The American School Counselor Association is recognized as the "national organization which represents the profession of school counseling" (Campbell & Dahir, 1997, p. 52). Since its inception in 1952, the American School Counselor Association has established and promoted school counseling philosophies, role definitions, accountability, and professionalism. Until the 1997 publication of Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs, the organization had not produced standards for the development and

implementation of school counseling programs that were supported by national research (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). The national standards as presented by the American School Counselor Association are "a public statement of what students should know and be able to do as a result of participating in a school counseling program" (Campbell & Dahir, 1997, p. 1). Mariani (1998) contended that the development of the national standards provided school principals and counselors with a prototype for developing and implementing programs to best serve students in their schools.

The governing board of the American School Counselor Association defined school counseling as:

> Counseling is the process of helping people by assisting them in making decisions and changing behavior. School counselors work with all students, school staff, families, and members of the community as an integral part of the education program. School counseling programs promote school success through a focus on academic achievements, prevention and intervention activities, advocacy, and social/emotional and career development (Campbell & Dahir, 1997, p. 8).

This definition is supported by the association's recommendation for comprehensive developmental counseling programs. These programs should reach students through three developmental areas: academic, career, and personal/social (Campbell & Dahir, 1997).

In her study that led to the development of the American School Counselor Association's National Standards for School Counseling Programs, Dahir (1997) reported that 91% of the counselors responding to the survey indicated that the need for national standards was "to more clearly define the role of school counseling programs" (p. 114). The roles of school counselors in comprehensive school counseling programs are included

in the national standards. Direct service to students, parents, and faculty is considered the primary function of school counselors. A minimum of 70%, and preferably 80%, of counselors' time should be spent in direct services. The American School Counselor Association also recommends counselor-student ratio of 1:100 as ideal and 1:300 as maximum. Other tasks attributed to school counselors include "program planning, maintenance and evaluation, participation in school site planning and implementation, partnerships and alliances with postsecondary institutions, businesses, and community agencies, and other tasks which enhance the mission of the program" (Campbell & Dahir, 1997, p. 67). Mariani (1998) noted that the development and implementation of effective school counseling programs, based on the national standards, would serve to rid school counselors of administrative and clerical tasks.

Components of school counseling programs which integrate academic, career, and personal/social developmental areas include "counseling, consultation, collaboration, coordination, case management, guidance curriculum, and program evaluation" (Campbell & Dahir, 1997, p. 11). To deliver appropriate comprehensive developmental school counseling programs, counselors' tasks must be limited to services directly related to the goals of the counseling program. Inappropriate counseling tasks often performed by school counselors include, but are not limited to: registration and scheduling, maintaining student records, and computing averages. Appropriate school counselor tasks are assisting students with academic planning, interpreting student records, and relating averages to achievement and ability (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). Counselors freed from inappropriate tasks can create effective developmental counseling programs that complement and improve student learning (Mariani, 1998).

Appropriate and Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks. In addition to recommending a counselor to student ratio of 1/100 (ideal) to 1/300 (acceptable), the American School Counselor Association maintains that counselors spend 70-80% of their time in direct contact with students. Appropriate and inappropriate program tasks are listed in Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs.

Inappropriate non-school counseling program tasks include:

- registration and scheduling of all new students
- administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests
- responsibility for signing excuses for students who are tardy or absent
- teaching classes when teachers are absent
- performing disciplinary actions
- sending students home who are not appropriately dressed
- computing grade-point averages
- maintaining student records
- supervising study halls
- clerical record keeping
- assisting with duties in the principal's office

Appropriate school counseling program tasks include:

- individual student academic program planning
- interpreting cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests
- counseling students who are tardy or absent
- collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons
- counseling students who have disciplinary problems

- counseling students as to appropriate school dress
- analyzing grade-point averages in relationship to achievement
- interpreting student records
- providing teachers with suggestions for better management of study halls
- ensuring that student records are maintained as per state and federal regulations
- assisting the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems (Campbell & Dahir, 1997, p. 13).

Principals and the Guidance and Counseling Program

Principals are the Leaders of their Schools

"Supervision means overseeing the work of others for the purpose of improving performance and strengthening professional development" (Henderson & Lampe, 1992, p. 151). Ripley (1996), defining supervision in a similar manner, also noted the importance of supervision in developing counseling competencies. In most schools, principals have the responsibility for the supervision of counselors (Anderson, 1994). Lunenburg (1998), in writing about techniques of supervision, contended that supervision was one of the most important roles performed by school principals. As described previously, the state of Georgia implemented an evaluation program for school counselors that reflected the roles expected of them. Anderson (1994) implied that the strongest aspect of the counselor evaluation program, which is no longer mandated by the state, was in its definition of counselors' roles. Although the state of Georgia no longer supports the evaluation program, many of the state's school systems continue to use it because it provides a framework for the evaluation and supervision of school counselors (Anderson, 1995).

Barletta (1995) cited three purposes for supervision: "Firstly, supervision ensures that those entering the profession have appropriate fundamental skills. Secondly, it enhances the functioning of counselors, and finally it ensures the quality of service to clients" (p. 11). Secondary school counselors and secondary school counseling programs must be accountable to students, parents, other educators, and the community. Accountability requires evaluation (Gysbers, 1995; Matthay, 1988). Gysbers noted that evaluation should measure the effectiveness of the entire guidance and counseling program, the personnel, and the benefits to students, parents, faculty, and community.

The majority (61%) of Wisconsin secondary school counselors who participated in a study by Gorton and Ohlemacher (1987) indicated their evaluations were handled by their principals. In her study on evaluation procedures, Matthay (1988) surveyed public high school counselors in Connecticut. From her data collection, Matthay found that the majority of counselor evaluators were their principals. Barletta (1995) noted that many counselor supervisors were noncounseling personnel. Evaluation of school counselors "is based directly on their job task descriptions and usually has two parts: a formative part (supervision) and a summative part (evaluation)" (Gysbers, 1995, p. 1). Evans (1992) suggested summative evaluation should be the responsibility of the principal, but supervision could be appropriately performed by empowered peers.

With the wide variety of tasks they perform, counselors are confronted with many legal issues (Barletta, 1995). Counselors need professional support from supervisors as a precaution for potential legal entanglements as well as for professional development. If appropriate counselor supervisors cannot be furnished within the school system, supervisory resources from the community should be sought (Barletta, 1995). Herndon

(1990) also noted the importance of responsible supervision of counselors. She emphasized the need for counselor supervisors to be updated with accurate legal information.

Types of Counselor Supervision

Roberts and Borders (1994) conducted a study of supervision methods used by administrators for school counselors in the state of North Carolina. The survey for this study included three types of supervision:

> (a) administrative, defined as supervision focused on employee attendance, punctuality, staff relations, and outreach to parents; (b) program, defined as supervision focused on program development, implementation, and coordination (i.e., classroom guidance, peer tutoring, etc.); and (c) counseling or clinical, defined as supervision focused on enhancing one's clinical knowledge and skill working with students in individual or group counseling sessions, and in consultation with parents and teachers (p. 150).

Data analyzed from this study indicated that 85% of the counselors received administrative supervision, 70% received program supervision, and 37% received counseling supervision. The data analysis also showed that 86% of the counselors preferred program supervision, 79% preferred counseling supervision, and 59% preferred administrative supervision. Administrative and program supervision were required by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. Also included in this survey was a question asking for opinions on the relationship between supervision and evaluation. The responses to this question indicated 54% believed supervision and evaluation were dissimilar and 29% felt there was some similarity between the two activities (Roberts & Borders, 1994).

Comprehensive evaluation of school guidance and counseling program requires program, personnel, and results evaluation (Gysbers, 1995). Henderson and Lampe (1992) also categorized counselor supervision into three types: administrative, developmental, and clinical. The functions of each supervisory area are essentially the same as the areas noted by Roberts and Borders. Evaluations provided from supervision in each area endeavor to improve counselor and counseling program effectiveness (Henderson, 1994). Barletta (1995) recognized two types of supervision. In describing clinical supervision, he called it a professional specialty that should be performed by an appropriately trained counselor. He acknowledged that principals could serve as administrative supervisors. Paisley and Borders (1995) and Ripley (1996) pointed out that most school counselors do not receive clinical supervision due to the lack of staff qualified to supervise and perform evaluations.

Empowerment and Shared Decision-Making

Murray (1995) offered approaches for principals to use in becoming more effective supervisors of school counselors. In addition to reading counseling journals, keeping abreast of counseling legislation, and becoming knowledgeable of counseling organizations, Murray proposed a cooperative working relationship between principals and counselors for the purpose of defining roles, supervising, and evaluating. She recommended the use of shared decision-making by teams to develop and implement guidance and counseling programs appropriate for individual schools.

Goldring and Chen (1992) acknowledged that most school principals began their career path to administration as teachers. In the past, students in educational administration programs started with knowledge of teaching, but with little knowledge of

leadership. As more emphasis has been placed on teacher empowerment, students in educational administration programs are more experienced in school organization outside of the classroom. Principals who have functioned as lead teachers, department heads, or in other leadership capacities have diverse educational experiences to add to their academic study in leadership (Goldring & Chen, 1992). "Good leaders establish processes or strategies that align the needs and values of individuals and groups with the mission and goals of the organization" (Ornstein, 1993, p. 3). Faculty cooperation is more prevalent in schools with principals who promote staff involvement in making decisions and implementing these decisions (Ornstein, 1993). Riley (1991) maintained that principals who empowered their faculties would notice improved individual performances and more collaborative efforts from their faculties toward total school improvement.

Empowerment was defined by Whitaker and Moses (1990) as "giving teachers more power to shape the decisions affecting their work and their profession" (p. 127). Referencing Chapman and Hutcheson, Whitaker and Moses emphasized that shared decision-making contributed to feelings of ownership, which in turn stimulated creativity, commitment, and production. Faculty members who serve as instructional leaders, even as evaluators and supervisors of peers, are empowered with responsibility that often promotes collegiality and professionalism (Goldring & Chen, 1992).

Future of Guidance and Counseling in Secondary Schools

Restructuring Education for the 21st Century

In his paper on supervision skills for school reform, Cromwell (1991) suggested that educational institutions needed to seek continued improvement. He wrote, "It may even be argued that the very future of human kind rests with the ability of education to be

continually reformed and improved" (p. 3). Dissatisfaction with current instructional and administrative aspects of schools is basic to restructuring movements (Whitaker & Moses, 1990). "The American school system is asked to increase test scores and academic output; yet, many other variables in the society take 75 percent of the student's day and all the student's weekend" (Paul, 1994, p. 41). In addition to academic skills, leaders of corporate America stressed the need for social skills for students in the 21st century. From a survey conducted by Nidds and McGerald (1995), chief executive officers of "Fortune 500" corporations responded that schools of all grade levels needed to stress interpersonal skills. They also indicated the importance of helping students develop leadership skills, responsibility, and decision-making skills. Another voice from corporate America, Lee Iacocca (1991), wrote that American students did not perform well because they were not in school long enough. He advocated a longer school year.

In a study on school restructuring, Greer (1995) sought to find common bonds that administrators used in defining the term, restructuring. The findings from her study found that the common goal for restructuring was that of increasing student learning and performance. One of several definitions for restructuring that resulted from her study was, "Restructuring is changing, reforming, transforming, or redesigning the system, structure, curriculum, and instruction of education or the school, so that all students learn" (p. 87).

Boley (1994) placed the school counselor at the center of school restructuring efforts. Stanciak (1995) agreed that counselors are important to school reform, with the provision that counselors' roles are also reformed. She asserted that counselors should be involved in planning, implementation, and evaluation. She also wrote that counselors should, "have the opportunity to restructure the guidance and counseling program so that

it is an integral part of the school system, and so that it is instrumental in fostering success, productivity, and positive mental health for all students" (p. 2). Boley (1994) also emphasized the importance of counselors acting as advocates for proactive guidance and counseling programs as a restructured component of the entire school. Campbell and Dahir (1997) urged counselors to be leaders in educational reform.

Restructuring Guidance and Counseling for the 21st Century

Schools are affected by changes in society (Stalling, 1991). As society changes, students also change. These student changes create needs for updated guidance and counseling services (Huey, 1987). "Society is the engine that drives education and school counseling as well" (Hentsch, 1996, p. 15). In his study, Hentsch (1996) concluded that secondary school counseling was changing with society, albeit slowly. He also noted that secondary school counselors were still performing some of the same tasks performed 25 years ago.

Stalling (1991) wrote, "The typical problems of schools of the 21st century would include children who are drug and alcohol abusers, increased numbers of children who are sexually active, children suffering from the effects of crime, increased racial conflicts, and unemployment" (p. 1). She suggested that the original roles of counselors, vocational guidance and career counseling, unite with other areas and expand guidance and counseling programs to include decision-making and self-esteem, among others (Stalling, 1991). Secondary school counselors are becoming more essential in the daily lives of students (Coy, 1991). Consequently, the roles and tasks of secondary school counselors should be driven by the specific needs of the students, parents, faculty, and community of the local school system (Thomas & Hutchinson, 1992).

Carroll (1993) conducted a study on the perceived roles and the need for change in preparation experiences of elementary school counselors. He noted that schools of today are not only expected to provide traditional education for students, but they are expected to provide this conventional education to students who come from a current population with daily statistics of 100,000 homeless children, 3,000 daily divorces, and 6 daily teenage suicides. Ballard and Murgatroyd (1999) maintained that children were under greater pressures at earlier ages because of lack of parental support and that schools must meet these changing needs of students. "The school reform movement has asked counselors to provide additional services to students" (Greer & Richardson, 1992, p. 93). Thomas and Hutchinson (1992) concluded that schools must assume educational roles previously handled by parents and the community.

Summary

Historically, secondary school counselors' roles have been inconsistent and unclear. The tasks performed by secondary school counselors are multidimensional. Many tasks are inappropriate for comprehensive developmental guidance and counseling programs. Literature supports the fact that these tasks assigned by principals to secondary school counselors are the defining elements of counselors' roles, thus the lack of consistency and clarity.

Supervision and evaluation of secondary school counselors is critical to individual and program improvement. In most instances, principals serve both as supervisors and evaluators of secondary school counselors, yet as the literature supports, many principals are not knowledgeable of appropriate tasks for secondary school counselors.

Various state departments of education and professional organizations have made attempts to structure guidance and delivery systems statewide. The state of Georgia developed and implemented a state evaluation program for counselors. The program is no longer mandatory because of lack of state funding. The evaluation program, however, remains a valid assessment for local school systems to use in evaluating school counselors and counseling programs in their systems.

Nationally, the American School Counselor Association has provided states with standards for school counseling programs. In 1997, this organization published Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs. These standards are reflections from research data about what students should know and be able to do as a result of participating in school guidance programs. Listed in this publication are examples of appropriate and inappropriate tasks for school counselors. These tasks were developed into the instrument used in this study.

In Georgia there is a lack of current studies on the perceptions of public secondary school principals and counselors on tasks of secondary school counselors. There is no evidence of research in Georgia on appropriate and inappropriate tasks as cited in the American School Counselor Association's publication of Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs. This research study provides current data relating to tasks of secondary school counselors.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Research literature has supported the fact that secondary school counselors' roles have been undefined and ambiguous throughout the history of the profession. Also supported by the literature is the importance of supervision and evaluation of counselors. The supervisors and evaluators of secondary school counselors are often the principals of the high schools. Principals may be unaware of the roles counselors should perform in schools, and as a result they may assign counselors tasks incongruent with comprehensive developmental counseling programs. Secondary school counselors, working without a comprehensive developmental guidance and counseling plan, often accept the assignments of inappropriate tasks.

The American School Counselor Association, after a national survey of school counselors, prepared a publication to serve as a resource guide for developing and implementing comprehensive developmental counseling programs. The publication, Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs, presents national standards for school counseling programs. The purpose of establishing the national standards for school counseling programs is to make a public statement about what "students should know and be able to do as a result of participating in school counseling programs" (Campbell & Dahir, 1997, p. 1).

Research Questions

The major question guiding this study was:

Do the perceptions of public secondary school principals and counselors in Georgia differ as to involvement in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as specified by the American School Counselor Association?

The research questions addressed in this study are:

1. What are the actual involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school principals in Georgia?
2. What are the actual involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school counselors in Georgia?
3. What are the desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school principals in Georgia?
4. What are the desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school counselors in Georgia?
5. Are there differences in the actual and desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school principals?
6. Are there differences in the actual and desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as

reported by public secondary school counselors?

7. Are there differences in counselors' and principals' perceptions of actual involvements in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks?
8. Are there differences in counselors' and principals' perceptions of desired involvements in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks?

Methodology

Subjects

This quantitative study included two populations: school principals and school counselors employed by public, secondary schools in Georgia. The Georgia Department of Education considers all schools containing grades 8-12 or 9-12 as high schools. Schools including grade levels outside these two ranges are considered secondary schools if the majority of their students are within the high school ranges (Georgia Department of Education, 1999). According to these qualifications, the number of secondary schools in Georgia is 331 (Georgia Department of Education, 1999).

For this study, secondary schools considered by the Georgia Department of Education as special entities, such as blind and deaf academies, alternative or crossroads schools, and special education schools were not included as sources for obtaining the population. Also eliminated were open campus schools, night or evening schools, and magnet schools. The school systems of Cobb County, DeKalb County, Gwinnett County, Houston County, and Muscogee County required prior approval for research within their systems and were excluded from this study. With these eliminations, the population of secondary school principals was 264, one for each secondary school included in the

research. As verified by the Georgia Department of Education, the secondary school counselor population was 650 (M. Fleming, personal communication, April 7, 1999).

Design

This was a quantitative, descriptive research study designed to collect data on the perceptions of Georgia public secondary school principals and counselors as to actual involvement and desired involvement of secondary school counselors in 22 appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. The study had one independent variable, professional position as secondary school principals or secondary school counselors. The dependent variables were the ratings of actual involvement and desired involvement in each of 22 counseling program task statements. Secondary school principals and counselors were asked to indicate on Likert scales, levels of actual involvement and levels of desired involvement on each of 22 counseling program tasks. All respondents were asked to furnish demographic information.

Instruments

Two survey instruments were designed for this study: one for secondary school principals (Appendix D) and one for secondary school counselors (Appendix E). With two exceptions, the two versions of the survey were identical: the instructions and the demographic data requested were specific to the different populations. The two surveys were designed to gather data on the perceptions of secondary school principals and counselors in public secondary schools in Georgia as to the desired and actual involvements of counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks.

The two survey instruments were comprised of two parts. Part I contained the Likert scales for actual and desired involvement of secondary school counselors in the 22 counseling program task areas as listed by the American School Counselors Association's publication, Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). Part II asked for demographic data from the respondents.

Part I. The secondary school counselors' tasks selected for the survey instruments were those listed by the American School Counselor Association in their publication, Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs. This publication, which presents national standards for school counseling programs, includes a listing of tasks considered appropriate and a listing of tasks considered inappropriate for school counseling programs. Each list contains 11 tasks (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). The 11 appropriate tasks were randomly mixed with the 11 inappropriate tasks and listed on each instrument.

On part I, the participants were asked to respond to two Likert scales for each of the 22 task items listed. One scale sought actual involvement ratings and the other scale solicited desired involvement ratings. The Likert scale contained five categories:1=no involvement, 2=little involvement, 3=some involvement, 4=much involvement, and 5=total involvement. Two columns, one to the left of the task statements for actual involvement and one to the right of the task statements for desired involvement, listed the numbers for the Likert ratings.

Part II. On part II, both survey instruments asked participants to furnish demographic data. The demographic sections were slightly different for the two populations. Data sought for both populations were sex and certification level. The

instrument for principals asked for the number of years of administrative experience and the titles of the persons in their schools or systems responsible for assigning tasks to counselors. The counselors' instrument asked for the number of years of counseling experience, counselors' employment status as part-time or full-time, and the titles of the persons in their schools or systems responsible for assigning tasks to counselors.

Validity, Pilot Testing, and Reliability

Validity. Dahir (1997) conducted a national study of school counselors. Her study became the research base for the development of the American School Counselor Association's publication of Sharing the Vision, The National Standards for School Counseling Programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). In this publication, the appropriate and inappropriate tasks for school counseling programs are listed. Content validity was established by using those tasks published in this professional statement of national school counseling program standards.

Pilot Testing. The survey instruments were field tested by three principals and three counselors in three public secondary schools in Georgia. The schools were selected for their close proximity to the researcher which allowed for verbal input as well as written. The participants in the pilot study were not included in the populations surveyed. The pilot study participants were asked to critique the clarity of instructions, the formatting of the instrument, and the readability of the questions. They also were asked to make any other comments that would improve the quality of the instrument. The pilot study participants did not make suggestions for improvement so the instrument was used as originally designed.

Reliability. Internal consistency reliability was calculated for the entire population after return of the surveys using Cronbach's alpha. Huck and Cromier (1996) defined internal consistency reliability as "consistency across the parts of a measuring instrument" (p. 78). Because alpha is multi-purposeful and applicable to various types of scales (Suter, 1998), Cronbach's alpha was used to determine internal consistency reliability of both the principals' instrument and the counselors' instrument. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was determined to be .78 for the principals' actual tasks involvement scale, .79 for the principals' desired tasks involvement scale, .77 for the counselors' actual tasks involvement scale, and .77 for the counselors' desired tasks involvement scale.

Data Collection

In early May, 1999, survey packets were mailed to the principal of each of the 264 secondary schools in Georgia. Each principal received: (a) the survey instrument for the principal (see Appendix D) with a cover letter attached (Appendix F), (b) the survey instrument for the counselors (Appendix E) with cover letters attached (Appendix G), and (c) stamped and self-addressed return envelopes for each participant. The cover letters for both principals and counselors provided instructions for completing the surveys. The instructions asked the participants to complete the survey by indicating on the Likert scales the actual levels of counselor involvement and desired levels of counselor involvement in each of the 22 counseling program tasks. Instructions also asked them to complete a short demographic section. They were asked to return the surveys in the attached stamped and addressed return envelopes. Participants were apprised of envelope coding; they were told that the coding would be used for tracking returns only and would

not be used in reporting research results. The cover letters for the principals also gave instructions for distributing the counselors' surveys, cover letters, and return envelopes.

For coding purposes, each of the 264 secondary schools whose principals and counselors were surveyed were assigned a number. The number for each school was written in the lower left hand corner of the survey return envelopes for all participants in that school. Participants were asked to return the surveys within a three week period of time. Follow up phone calls were made to participants who had not responded in the three week time period.

Because survey returns for the May, 1999 mailing were low in numbers, a second mailing of surveys was sent in August, 1999. For this mailing, the cover letter, the survey instrument, and the return envelope were mailed individually to counselors and to principals in schools with no May response. These participants were asked to respond by September 7, 1999. Survey response after this deadline was 187 principal returns (70.83%) and 393 counselor returns (64.46%). Data analysis was performed on this return rate.

Data Analysis

The major research question that guided this study involved the differences in perceptions of secondary school principals and counselors toward involvement in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. Other questions asked for the actual and desired involvements of counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by both secondary school principals and counselors.

The initial data analysis involved calculation of percentages of involvement for each Likert scale rating in each task area for both actual involvement and desired

involvement by both principals and counselors. For example, percentages were obtained for the Likert rating of total involvement for the first task listed on the instrument for both actual involvement and desired involvement as reported by principals. Percentages were calculated for each Likert rating: no involvement, little involvement, some involvement, much involvement, and total involvement. These percentages were calculated for actual involvement and desired involvement in each of the 22 counseling program task areas listed for both principals and counselors. The percentages were compiled to provide ranges of responses for each task item as reported by counselors and principals for desired involvement and for actual involvement.

Using the descriptive statistics of means and standard deviations, the average level of involvement and the variability for each counseling program task item was calculated as reported by principals for actual involvement and desired involvement and as reported by counselors for actual involvement and desired involvement. Because the ratings involved a numeric scale, rankings were determined for actual and desired levels of involvement for secondary school principals and secondary school counselors. Using these rankings, the relative importance of the tasks for each group (principals actual involvement, principals desired involvement, counselors actual involvement, and counselors desired involvement) were noted.

Significance of differences between secondary school principals and secondary school counselors perceptions of actual and desired counseling task involvements were obtained using dependent and independent t tests. A series of independent t tests compared the responses of the principals and the counselors on each task item. Principals' ratings of actual involvement in each specific appropriate and inappropriate program task

were compared to counselors' ratings of actual involvement on the same specific appropriate and inappropriate counseling program task. Principals' ratings of desired involvement in each specific appropriate and inappropriate program task were compared to counselors' ratings of desired involvement on the same specific appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks.

The dependent t tests were performed to compare actual and desired ratings by each group. Principals' ratings on actual involvement in any specific appropriate and inappropriate counseling program task area were compared to their ratings on desired involvement in the same appropriate and inappropriate counseling program task area. Counselors' ratings on actual involvement in any specific appropriate and inappropriate program task area were compared to their ratings on desired involvement in the same appropriate and inappropriate counseling program task area.

Summary

This study utilized two research instruments to survey two populations, secondary school principals and secondary school counselors, in public schools in Georgia. Appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks for school counselors as presented by the American School Counselor Association formed the content area of the survey. Content validity was established by the document, Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs, which evolved from a national research project. Principals and counselors of three high schools participated in a pilot study.

Descriptive and inferential statistical analyses of the data involved percentages, means, standard deviations, dependent t tests, and independent t tests. A comprehensive review of analysis results is presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER 4

REPORT OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

Research has documented that secondary school counselors' roles have been inconsistent and unclear throughout the development of school guidance and counseling (Dahir, 1997; Topor, 1997). In addition to being multidimensional, secondary school counselors' tasks have often been inappropriate for comprehensive developmental guidance and counseling programs (Murray, 1995; Thomas & Hutchinson, 1992). Secondary school principals, as leaders of their schools, often assign tasks to counselors and serve as their supervisors and evaluators (Cole, 1991; Henry, 1989; Thomas & Hutchinson, 1992).

Many states have made attempts to structure guidance and counseling (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). In Georgia an evaluation program for counselors provided an assessment tool for local school systems to use in evaluating school counselors and counseling programs in their systems. This program is no longer mandated in Georgia (Anderson, 1994).

In 1997, the American School Counselor Association published Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs. These standards provide a base for all schools in the United States to use in the development of guidance and counseling programs. Listed in this publication are examples of appropriate and inappropriate tasks for school counseling programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). This research study examined the perceptions of public secondary school counselors and

principals in the state of Georgia regarding these appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks.

The major question guiding this study was: Do the perceptions of public secondary school principals and counselors in Georgia differ as to involvement in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as specified by the American School Counselor Association?

The research questions addressed in this study are:

1. What are the actual involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school principals in Georgia?
2. What are the actual involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school counselors in Georgia?
3. What are the desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school principals in Georgia?
4. What are the desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school counselors in Georgia?
5. Are there differences in the actual and desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school principals?
6. Are there differences in the actual and desired involvements of secondary

school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school counselors?

7. Are there differences in counselors' and principals' perceptions of actual involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks?
8. Are there differences in counselors' and principals' perceptions of desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks?

Survey Response Rate

For this study, data were collected from two populations: principals and counselors in public secondary schools in Georgia. These two populations represented 264 secondary schools. The principal population was 264, one for each secondary school. The Georgia Department of Education verified the secondary school counselor population to be 650 (M. Fleming, personal communication, April 7, 1999). The survey return for principals was 187 (70.83%) and the return rate for counselors was 393 (60.46%).

Demographic Data for Population

Table 1 represents the demographic data reported by public secondary school principals and counselors in Georgia responding to the survey.

Table 1

Demographic Data Reported by Principals and Counselors in Public Secondary Schools in Georgia: Percentages

Demographic Category	Principals	Counselors
Certification Level		
5th Year	12.8%	54.1%
6th Year	69.5	41.8
7th Year	17.7	4.1
Years of Experience		
0-10	34.2	51.9
11-20	33.2	23.3
21+	32.6	24.8
Gender		
Female	19.8	77.7
Male	80.2	22.3
Employed		
Part-time	-	1.5
Full-time	-	98.5
Tasks Assigned by		
School Principal	67.4	56.1
Director of Guidance	5.3	8.8
Superintendent/BOE	5.9	5.4
Combination	21.4	29.7

Note. Employment status was not asked on the survey for principals.

Principals N=187. Counselors N=393.

From the demographic information reported by secondary school principals and counselors, the majority of the principals held 6th year certificates (69.5%). The years of administrative experience reported were distributed relatively evenly: 0-10 years (34.2%), 11-20 years (33.2%), and 21+ (32.6%). Most principals were males (80.2%). The majority of secondary school principals reported that they assigned tasks to counselors (67.4%).

The demographic data supplied by counselors indicated the majority of the counselors held 5th year certificates (54.1%). About half of the counselors (51.9%) reported 0-10 years of experience. Most counselors (77.7%) were female and 98.5% of them were employed full-time. Most secondary school counselors also reported that their tasks were assigned by their principals (56.1%).

Responses to Survey Items

The survey developed for this study was designed to investigate the perceptions of secondary school principals and counselors on actual and desired involvement in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as presented in the American School Counselor Association's publication, Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs.

Research Question 1: What are the actual involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school principals in Georgia?

This research question examined the actual level of involvement of secondary school counselors in the 22 appropriate and inappropriate counseling program task areas as rated by secondary school principals.

Table 2 contains a percentage range of Likert responses from principals for actual involvement in each of the appropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 2

Actual Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Appropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Principals: Percentages

Appropriate Tasks	No	Little	Some	Much	Total	N
Ensuring record maintenance	1.1%	4.9%	12.6%	31.3%	50.0%	182
Planning academic program	0.6	1.7	12.2	38.1	47.5	181
Interpreting test results	2.2	8.8	20.4	31.5	37.0	181
Assisting principal in identifying student needs	3.3	12.6	30.8	38.5	14.8	182
Suggesting to help teachers with study halls	83.7	9.3	5.8	0.6	0.6	172
Counseling with tardy or absent students	19.2	25.8	35.7	17.0	2.2	182
Collaborating with teachers	10.1	16.8	35.8	24.0	13.4	179
Counseling students with disciplinary problems	7.7	22.5	41.8	20.3	7.7	182
Counseling students about dress	35.2	27.5	24.7	8.2	4.4	182
Interpreting student records	1.1	2.7	14.3	28.6	53.3	182
Analyzing averages in relation to achievement	6.6	6.6	23.6	30.2	33.0	182

Much and total actual involvement sums of 50% or greater were reported by principals in the appropriate counseling program task areas of planning academic programs (85.6%), interpreting student records (81.9%), ensuring record maintenance (81.3%), interpreting test results (68.5%), and analyzing averages in relationship to achievement (63.2%) was reported by principals. Little or no actual involvement was reported by principals in the appropriate counseling program task areas of suggestions to help teachers with study halls (93.0%) and counseling students about appropriate dress (62.7%).

Table 3 contains a percentage range of Likert responses from principals for actual involvement in each of the inappropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 3

Actual Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Principals: Percentages

Inappropriate Tasks	No	Little	Some	Much	Total	N
Performing disciplinary actions	65.4%	26.9%	6.0%	1.6%	0.0%	182
Assisting with duties in principal's office	36.5	29.8	26.5	5.5	1.7	181
Maintaining student records	2.7	5.5	14.8	34.1	42.9	182
Registering and scheduling new students	1.1	5.6	12.2	26.7	54.4	180
Administering tests	3.9	8.8	11.0	29.3	47.0	181
Signing excuses for absent or tardy students	92.3	3.8	3.3	0.0	0.5	187
Teaching classes when teachers are absent	95.1	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	187
Keeping clerical records	13.8	23.2	30.9	22.7	9.4	181
Supervising study halls	98.3	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.6	173
Computing averages	21.8	9.5	15.1	17.9	35.8	179
Sending students home for inappropriate dress	87.0	4.4	3.9	2.2	0.6	181

Much and total actual involvement sums of 50% or greater were reported by principals in the inappropriate counseling program tasks of registering and scheduling all new students (81.1%), maintaining student records (77.0%), administering tests (76.3%), and computing grade point averages (53.7%). In the inappropriate counseling program task area of keeping clerical records, principals reported actual involvements of counselors as: no or little involvement (37%), some involvement (30.9%), and much or total involvement (32.1%). Little or no actual involvement was reported by principals for the inappropriate counseling program tasks of teaching classes when teachers were absent (100%), supervising study halls (98.9%), sending students home for inappropriate dress (93.4%), performing disciplinary actions (92.3%), and assisting with duties in the principal's office (66.3%).

Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations of the principals' ratings for actual involvement in each of the appropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 4

Actual Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Appropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Principals: Means and Standard Deviations

Appropriate Tasks	M	SD	N
Planning academic program	4.30	0.79	181
Interpreting student records	4.30	0.89	182
Ensuring record maintenance	4.24	0.93	182
Interpreting test results	3.92	1.06	181
Analyzing averages in relation to achievement	3.76	1.17	182
Assisting principal in identifying student needs	3.49	1.00	182
Collaborating with teachers	3.14	1.15	179
Counseling students with disciplinary problems	2.98	1.02	182
Counseling tardy/absent students	2.57	1.05	182
Counseling students about dress	2.19	1.14	182
Suggestions to help teachers with study halls	1.25	0.64	172

Note. A higher mean value represents greater involvement (1 = no involvement...5 = total involvement).

Two appropriate counseling program task areas received the highest mean ratings by principals for actual involvement of counselors: planning academic programs (M=4.30, SD=.79) and interpreting student records (M=4.30, SD=.89). The second highest rated area was ensuring record maintenance (M=4.24, SD=.93). The lowest mean rating was in the area of offering suggestions to teachers for management of study halls (M=1.25, SD=.64). Counseling students with disciplinary problems (M=2.98, SD=1.02), counseling with absent or tardy students (M=2.57, SD=1.05), and counseling students about appropriate dress (M=2.19, SD=1.14) were appropriate counseling program task areas also receiving low mean ratings for actual involvement of counselors.

Table 5 contains the means and standard deviations of the principals' ratings for actual involvement in each of the inappropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 5

Actual Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Principals: Means and Standard Deviations

Inappropriate Tasks	M	SD	N
Registering and scheduling all new students	4.28	0.96	180
Maintaining student records	4.09	1.02	182
Administering tests	4.07	1.13	181
Computing averages	3.36	1.57	179
Keeping clerical records	2.91	1.18	181
Assisting with duties in principal's office	2.06	1.00	181
Performing disciplinary actions	1.44	0.68	182
Sending students home for inappropriate dress	1.21	0.67	181
Signing excuses for absent or tardy students	1.13	0.49	182
Teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.05	0.22	182
Supervising study halls	1.04	0.35	173

Note. A higher mean value represents greater involvement (1 = no involvement...5 = total involvement).

Mean ratings of principals for actual involvement in inappropriate counseling program tasks show the highest rating to be in the area of registering and scheduling of all new students (M=4.28, SD=.96) . The second highest rated area was maintaining student records (M=4.09, SD=1.02). The third highest rated area was administering tests (M=4.07, SD=1.13). The lowest mean rating was in the area of supervising study halls (M=1.04, SD=.35). Teaching classes for absent teachers (M=1.05, SD=.22), signing excuses for absent or tardy students (M=1.13, SD=0.49), sending students home for inappropriate dress (M=1.21, SD=0.67), and performing disciplinary actions (M=1.44, SD=0.68) were inappropriate counseling program task areas that also received low ratings for actual involvement of counselors.

Research Question 2: What are the actual involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school counselors in Georgia?

This research question examined the actual level of involvement of secondary school counselors in the 22 appropriate and inappropriate counseling program task areas as rated by secondary school counselors.

Table 6 contains a percentage range of Likert responses from counselors for actual involvement in each of the counseling program appropriate tasks.

Table 6

Actual Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Appropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Counselors: Percentages

Appropriate Tasks	No	Little	Some	Much	Total	N
Ensuring record maintenance	1.3%	6.6%	14.5%	31.3%	46.3%	380
Planning academic program	0.8	1.8	3.6	29.5	64.2	386
Interpreting test results	2.3	6.2	23.1	35.0	33.4	386
Assisting principal in identifying student needs	4.5	11.0	30.6	31.9	22.0	382
Suggesting to help teachers with study halls	81.0	8.9	7.3	2.2	0.6	358
Counseling with tardy or absent students	8.3	16.4	48.2	19.8	7.3	384
Collaborating with teachers	15.5	22.3	31.5	16.8	13.9	381
Counseling students with disciplinary problems	3.4	13.8	41.0	30.6	11.2	385
Counseling students about dress	29.8	30.5	28.2	7.3	4.2	383
Interpreting student records	0.5	1.8	7.0	31.6	59.1	386
Analyzing averages in relation to achievement	7.4	8.7	24.5	29.6	29.9	379

Much and total actual involvement sums of 50% or greater were reported by counselors in the appropriate counseling program task areas of planning academic programs (93.7%), interpreting student records (90.7%), ensuring record maintenance (77.6%), interpreting test results (68.4%), analyzing averages in relationship to achievement (59.4%), and assisting the principal in identifying student needs (53.9%). In the appropriate counseling program task area of collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons, counselors reported: no or little actual involvement (37.8%), some actual involvement (31.5%), and much or total actual involvement (30.7%). Some actual involvement in the appropriate counseling program task areas of counseling students who are tardy or absent (48.2%) and counseling students who have disciplinary problems (41.0%) indicated that counselors spent some time involved in those tasks. Little or no actual involvement was reported by counselors in the appropriate task areas of suggestions to help teachers with study halls (89.9%) and counseling students about appropriate dress (60.3%).

Table 7 contains a percentage range of Likert responses from counselors for actual involvement in each of the inappropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 7

Actual Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Counselors: Percentages

Inappropriate Tasks	No	Little	Some	Much	Total	N
Performing disciplinary actions	54.0%	31.7%	10.6%	3.4%	0.3%	385
Assisting with duties in principals' office	33.8	30.4	21.2	11.3	3.4	382
Maintaining student records	3.9	9.1	11.9	29.6	45.5	385
Registering and scheduling new students	1.3	2.3	6.0	17.9	72.5	385
Administering tests	6.3	8.1	14.6	19.8	51.3	384
Signing excuses for absent or tardy students	78.8	11.6	5.7	2.6	1.3	387
Teaching classes when teachers are absent	90.9	7.0	1.8	0.0	0.3	386
Keeping clerical records	13.8	13.2	24.3	31.0	17.7	378
Supervising study halls	97.0	2.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	368
Computing averages	30.7	9.0	16.4	15.1	28.8	378
Sending students home for inappropriate dress	84.9	6.0	6.0	1.3	1.8	384

Much and total actual involvement sums of 50% or greater were reported by counselors in the inappropriate counseling program task areas of registering and scheduling of all new students (90.4%), maintaining student records (75.1%), and administering tests (71.1%). In the inappropriate counseling program task areas of supervising study halls (99.2%), sending students home for inappropriate dress (90.6%), signing excuses for tardy or absent students (90.4%), performing disciplinary actions (85.7%), and assisting with duties in the principal's office (64.2%), counselors reported no or little actual involvement.

Table 8 presents the means and standard deviations of the counselors' ratings for actual involvement in appropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 8

Actual Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Appropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Counselors: Means and Standard Deviations

Appropriate Tasks	M	SD	N
Planning academic program	4.55	0.72	386
Interpreting student records	4.47	0.75	386
Ensuring record maintenance	4.14	0.99	380
Interpreting test results	3.91	1.01	386
Analyzing averages in relation to achievement	3.66	1.20	379
Assisting principal in identifying student needs	3.56	1.08	382
Counseling students with disciplinary problems	3.32	0.96	385
Counseling tardy/absent students	3.01	0.99	384
Collaborating with teachers	2.91	1.25	381
Counseling students about dress	2.26	1.09	383
Suggestions to help teachers with study halls	1.32	0.75	358

Note. A higher mean value represents greater involvement (1 = no involvement...5 = total involvement).

Mean ratings of counselors for actual involvement in appropriate counseling program tasks show the highest mean rating to be in the area of planning academic programs (M=4.55, SD=.72). The second highest rated area was interpreting student records (M=4.47, SD=.75). Ensuring record maintenance (M=4.15, SD=.99) was the third highest rated area. The lowest mean rating was in the area of providing teachers with suggestions for better management of study halls (M=1.82, SD=.75). Other appropriate counseling program task areas receiving low mean ratings were: counseling students about dress (M=2.26, SD=1.09) and collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons (M=2.91, SD=1.25).

Table 9 contains the means and standard deviations of the counselors' ratings for actual involvement in inappropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 9

Actual Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Counselors: Means and Standard Deviations

Inappropriate Tasks	M	SD	N
Registering and scheduling all new students	4.58	0.81	385
Maintaining student records	4.04	1.4	385
Administering tests	4.02	1.24	384
Keeping clerical records	3.26	1.28	378
Computing averages	3.02	1.62	378
Assisting with duties in principal's office	2.20	1.13	382
Performing disciplinary actions	1.64	0.82	385
Signing excuses for absent or tardy students	1.36	0.81	387
Sending students home for inappropriate dress	1.29	0.79	384
Teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.12	0.41	386
Supervising study halls	1.05	0.31	368

Note. A higher mean value represents greater involvement (1 = no involvement...5 = total involvement).

Mean ratings of counselors for actual involvement in inappropriate counseling program tasks show the highest rating to be for registering and scheduling of all new students (M=4.58, SD=.81). The second highest rated area was maintaining student records (M=4.04, SD=.81). Administering tests (M=4.02, SD=1.24) was the third highest rated area. The lowest mean rating was in the area of supervising study halls (M=1.05, SD=.31). Teaching classes when teachers were absent (M=1.12, SD=.41), sending students home for inappropriate dress (M=1.29, SD=.70), signing excuses for absent or tardy students (M=1.36, SD=.81), and performing disciplinary actions (M=1.36, SD=.81) were inappropriate counseling program task areas also receiving low mean ratings.

Research Question 3: What are the desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school principals in Georgia?

This research question examined the desired level of involvement of secondary school counselors in the 22 appropriate and inappropriate counseling program task areas as rated by secondary school principals.

Table 10 contains a percentage range of Likert responses from principals for desired involvements in appropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 10

Desired Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Appropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Principals: Percentages

Appropriate Tasks	No	Little	Some	Much	Total	N
Ensuring record maintenance	3.2%	3.8%	9.1%	24.7%	59.1%	186
Planning academic program	1.1	0.5	2.2	32.3	64.0	186
Interpreting test results	0.0	2.7	8.2	30.4	58.7	184
Assisting principal in identifying student needs	1.1	3.2	19.9	45.2	30.6	186
Suggesting to help teachers with study halls	77.6	5.7	11.5	4.0	1.1	174
Counseling with tardy or absent students	12.0	12.0	29.3	35.3	11.4	184
Collaborating with teachers	2.7	5.4	20.7	42.9	23.1	184
Counseling students with disciplinary problems	3.2	7.0	24.2	42.5	23.1	186
Counseling students about dress	30.1	18.8	28.0	16.1	7.0	186
Interpreting student records	0.0	2.2	8.1	25.8	64.0	186
Analyzing averages in relation to achievement	2.7	3.2	15.6	33.3	45.2	186

Much and total desired involvement sums of 50% or greater were reported by principals in the appropriate task areas of planning academic programs (96.3%), interpreting student records (89.8%), interpreting test results (89.1%), ensuring record maintenance (83.8%), analyzing grade point averages in regards to achievement (78.5%), assisting the principal in identifying student needs (75.8%), collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons (72.2%), and counseling discipline problems (65.6%). Little or no desired involvements were reported by principals in the appropriate task area of providing teachers with suggestions for management of study halls (83.3%).

Table 11 shows a percentage range of Likert responses from principals for desired involvement in inappropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 11

Desired Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Principals: Percentages

Inappropriate Tasks	No	Little	Some	Much	Total	N
Performing disciplinary actions	65.9%	18.9%	11.4%	3.2%	0.5%	185
Assisting with duties in principal's office	37.5	23.9	29.3	7.1	2.2	184
Maintaining student records	5.9	4.8	13.4	22.6	53.2	186
Registering and scheduling new students	1.6	5.4	17.4	19.0	56.5	184
Administering tests	4.3	6.5	13.5	29.2	46.5	185
Signing excuses for absent or tardy students	90.9	4.8	2.7	1.1	0.5	186
Teaching classes when teachers are absent	90.8	4.3	3.8	1.1	0.0	185
Keeping clerical records	22.3	25.5	29.3	13.6	9.2	184
Supervising study halls	96.6	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	175
Computing averages	22.4	10.9	12.0	18.0	36.6	183
Sending students home for inappropriate dress	85.4	6.5	5.4	2.2	0.5	185

Much and total desired involvement sums of 50% or greater were reported by principals in the inappropriate counseling program task areas of maintaining student records (75.8%), administering tests (75.7%), and registering and scheduling all new students (75.5%). Principals reported little or no involvement in the inappropriate counseling program task areas of: supervising study halls (98.3%), signing excuses for absent or tardy students (95.7%), teaching classes for absent teachers (95.1%), sending students home for inappropriate dress (91.9%), performing discipline actions (84.8%), and assisting in the principal's office (61.4%).

Table 12 presents the means and standard deviations of the principals' ratings of desired involvement for appropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 12

Desired Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Appropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Principals: Means and Standard Deviations

Appropriate Tasks	M	SD	N
Planning academic programs	4.58	0.67	186
Interpreting student records	4.52	0.74	186
Interpreting test results	4.45	0.76	184
Ensuring record maintenance	4.33	1.01	186
Computing averages in relation to achievement	4.15	0.98	186
Assisting principal in identifying student needs	4.01	0.86	186
Collaborating with teachers	3.89	0.97	184
Counseling students with disciplinary problems	3.75	0.99	186
Counseling tardy/absent students	3.22	1.17	184
Counseling students about dress	2.51	1.27	186
Suggestions to help teachers with study halls	1.45	0.93	186

Note. A higher mean value represents greater involvement (1 = no involvement...5 = total involvement).

Mean ratings of principals for desired involvement in appropriate counseling program tasks show the highest rating to be in the area of planning academic programs (M=4.58, SD=.67). Other tasks receiving high mean ratings were: interpreting student records (M=4.52, SD=.74), interpreting test results (M=4.45, SD=.76), ensuring record maintenance (M=4.33, SD=1.01), analyzing grade point averages in relation to achievement (M=4.15, SD=.98), and assisting the principal in identifying student needs (M=4.01, SD=.86). The lowest mean rating was in the area of providing teachers with suggestions for managing study halls (M=1.45, SD=.93). Counseling students on appropriate dress (M=2.51, SD=1.27) was the second lowest mean rating.

Table 13 contains the means and standard deviations of the principals' ratings of desired involvement for inappropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 13

Desired Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Principals: Means and Standard Deviations

Inappropriate Tasks	M	SD	N
Registering and scheduling all new students	4.23	1.03	184
Maintaining student records	4.12	1.18	186
Administering tests	4.07	1.11	185
Computing averages	3.36	1.59	183
Keeping clerical records	2.61	1.23	184
Assisting with duties in principal's office	2.13	1.07	184
Performing disciplinary actions	1.56	0.86	185
Sending students home for inappropriate dress	1.26	0.71	185
Signing excuses for absent or tardy students	1.16	0.56	186
Teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.15	0.52	185
Supervising study halls	1.05	0.29	175

Note. A higher mean value represents greater involvement (1 = no involvement...5 = total involvement).

Mean ratings of principals for desired involvement in inappropriate counseling program tasks show the highest rating to be in the area of registering and scheduling all new students (M=4.23, SD=1.03). The second highest rated area was maintaining student records (M=4.12, SD=1.18). The third highest rated area was administering tests (M=4.07, SD=1.11). The lowest mean rating was in the area of supervising study halls (M=1.05, SD=.29) Other low mean ratings for inappropriate counseling program tasks were: teaching classes for absent teachers (M=1.15, SD=.52), signing excuses for tardy or absent students (M=1.16, SD=.56), sending students home for inappropriate dress (M=1.26, SD=.71), and performing disciplinary actions (M=1.56, SD=.86).

Research Question 4: What are the desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school counselors in Georgia?

This research question examined the desired level of involvement of secondary school counselors in the 22 appropriate and inappropriate counseling program task areas as rated by secondary school counselors.

Table 14 contains a percentage range of Likert responses from counselors for desired involvement in appropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 14

Desired Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Appropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Counselors: Percentages

Appropriate Task	No	Little	Some	Much	Total	N
Ensuring record maintenance	11.5%	15.6%	27.9%	19.2%	25.8%	365
Planning academic program	0.5	1.9	10.4	33.1	54.1	375
Interpreting test results	2.6	6.3	26.6	35.1	29.3	379
Assisting principal in identifying student needs	0.8	3.2	22.5	46.0	27.5	378
Suggestions to help teachers with study halls	75.0	7.8	9.2	7.5	0.6	348
Counseling tardy or absent students	9.8	17.2	44.7	22.5	5.8	378
Collaborating with teachers	4.6	4.0	26.1	38.4	26.9	372
Counseling students with disciplinary problems	4.0	12.2	36.6	31.3	15.9	377
Counseling students about dress	39.5	28.7	23.2	5.5	3.2	380
Interpreting student records	1.1	3.5	16.0	35.6	43.9	376
Analyzing averages in relation to achievement	5.4	8.9	30.9	30.1	24.7	372

Much and total desired involvement sums of 50% or greater were reported by counselors in the appropriate counseling program task areas of planning academic programs (87.2%), interpreting student records (79.5%), assisting the principal with identifying student needs (73.5%), collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons (65.3%), and interpreting test results (64.4%). In the area of counseling with tardy or absent students 44.7% of the counselors indicated they desired some involvement, 28.3% desired much or all involvement, and 17% desired little or no involvement. Little or no desired involvement was reported by principals in the appropriate counseling program task areas of providing teachers with suggestions for managing study halls (82.8%) and counseling students as to appropriate dress (68.2%).

Table 15 shows a percentage range of Likert responses from counselors for desired involvement in inappropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 15

Desired Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Counselors: Percentages

Inappropriate Tasks	No	Little	Some	Much	Total	N
Performing disciplinary actions	75.0%	19.5%	5.0%	0.3%	0.3%	380
Assisting with duties in principal's office	52.8	31.0	13.0	2.7	0.5	377
Maintaining student records	16.6	16.9	28.0	16.9	21.6	379
Registering and scheduling new students	8.2	12.7	35.0	16.7	27.3	377
Administering tests	12.7	14.0	34.9	20.9	17.5	378
Signing excuses for absent or tardy students	90.6	7.0	1.6	0.8	0.0	383
Teaching classes when teachers are absent	95.0	3.4	1.3	0.3	0.0	382
Keeping clerical records	42.7	32.8	19.1	3.5	1.9	372
Supervising study halls	96.7	2.5	0.6	0.3	0.0	362
Computing averages	39.2	15.6	19.1	10.2	15.9	372
Sending students home for inappropriate dress	92.1	4.2	2.6	0.5	0.5	379

No combined percentages of much and total involvement were calculated at 50% or greater. The highest percentage calculated for much and total desired involvement was 44.0% for the inappropriate counseling program task area of registering and scheduling new students. The second and third highest percentages were from the following inappropriate counseling task areas respectively: maintaining student records (38.5%) and administering tests (38.4%). In the area of administering tests, similar percentages were reported for much and all involvement (38.4%) and for little or no involvement (26.7%). High percentages for little or no involvement in inappropriate counseling program tasks were reported by the counselors for the areas of: supervising study halls (99.2%), teaching for teachers who are absent (98.4%), signing excuses for tardy or absent students (97.6%), sending students home for inappropriate dress (96.3%), performing disciplinary actions (94.5%), assisting with duties in the principal's office (83.8%), and keeping clerical records (75.5%).

Table 16 presents the means and standard deviations of the counselors' ratings of desired involvement for appropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 16

Desired Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Appropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Counselors: Means and Standard Deviations

Appropriate Tasks	M	SD	N
Planning academic program	4.38	0.79	375
Assisting principal in identifying student needs	3.96	0.84	378
Interpreting test results	3.82	1.01	379
Collaborating with teachers	3.79	1.03	372
Analyzing averages in relation to achievement	3.60	1.11	372
Counseling students with disciplinary problems	3.43	1.02	377
Ensuring record maintenance	3.32	1.32	365
Counseling tardy/absent students	2.97	1.01	378
Counseling students about dress	2.04	1.06	380
Suggestions to help teachers with study halls	1.51	0.98	348
Interpreting student records	0.18	0.90	376

Note. A higher mean value represents greater involvement (1 = no involvement...5 = total involvement).

Mean ratings of counselors for desired involvement in appropriate counseling program tasks show the highest rating to be in the area of planning academic programs (M=4.38, SD=.79). The second highest area was interpreting student records (M=4.18, SD=.90). The third highest rated area was assisting principal in identifying student needs (M=3.96, SD=.84). The lowest mean rating was in the area providing suggestions to teachers for management of study halls (M=1.51, SD=.98). Counseling students regarding appropriate dress (M=2.04, SD=1.06) was the second lowest mean rating for appropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 17 contains the means and standard deviations of the counselors' ratings of desired involvement for inappropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 17

Desired Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Counselors: Means and Standard Deviations

Inappropriate Tasks	M	SD	N
Registering and scheduling new students	3.42	1.24	377
Administering tests	3.16	1.24	378
Maintaining student records	3.10	1.36	379
Computing averages	2.48	1.48	372
Keeping clerical records	1.89	0.96	372
Assisting with duties in principal's office	1.67	0.84	377
Performing disciplinary actions	1.31	0.60	380
Sending students home for inappropriate dress	1.13	0.51	379
Signing excuses for absent or tardy students	1.13	0.43	383
Teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.07	0.32	382
Supervising study halls	1.04	0.26	362

Note. A higher mean value represents greater involvement (1 = no involvement...5 = total involvement).

Mean ratings of counselors for desired involvement in inappropriate counseling program tasks show the highest rating to be in the area of registering and scheduling all new students (M=3.42, SD=1.24). The second highest rated area was administering tests (M=3.16, SD=1.24). The third highest rated area was maintaining student records (M=3.10, SD=1.36). The lowest mean rating for desired involvement in inappropriate counseling program tasks was supervising study halls (M=1.04, SD=.26). Other low mean ratings were teaching classes for absent teachers (M=1.07, SD=.32), sending students home for inappropriate dress (M=1.13, SD=.51), and signing excuses for students who are absent or tardy (M=1.13, SD=.43).

Research Question 5: Are there differences in the actual and desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school principals?

This research question sought to determine if there was a difference in actual and desired involvement in each of the 22 appropriate and inappropriate counseling program task areas as reported by secondary school principals. A series of dependent t tests was used to compare principals' actual and desired involvement responses on appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. All tests were conducted at the .05 level of significance.

Table 18 presents dependent t test results for the principals' actual and desired involvement responses to appropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 18

Comparison of Actual and Desired Involvements in Appropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Principals: Dependent t test

	Actual		Desired			
Appropriate Tasks	M	SD	M	SD	N	t
Ensuring record maintenance	4.24	0.93	4.33	1.02	181	-1.22
Planning academic program	4.30	0.79	4.60	0.62	180	-5.50**
Interpreting test results	3.92	1.06	4.44	0.77	179	-7.93**
Assisting principal in identifying student needs	3.50	0.99	4.02	0.86	181	-8.31**
Suggestions to help teachers with study halls	1.25	0.64	1.44	0.91	170	-4.49**
Counseling tardy/absent students	2.56	1.05	3.22	1.17	179	-8.81**
Collaborating with teachers	3.13	1.16	3.89	0.96	177	-10.29**
Counseling students with disciplinary problems	2.98	1.02	3.75	1.00	181	-9.62**
Counseling students about dress	2.18	1.12	2.50	1.28	181	-4.76**
Interpreting student records	4.30	0.89	4.52	0.72	181	-4.22**
Analyzing averages and relating to achievement	3.76	1.17	4.15	0.97	181	-6.27**

Note. A higher mean value represents greater involvement (1 = no involvement...5 = total involvement).

*$p \leq .05$. **$p \leq .01$.

The dependent t test for principals' ratings of appropriate counseling program tasks showed the task area, ensuring record maintenance ($t = -1.22$, $p = .223$), to be the only task area with no significant difference between actual and desired involvement. Analysis of all other task areas indicated significant differences between actual and desired involvement in appropriate counseling program tasks as reported by principals. In each of the counseling program task areas showing significant differences between actual and desired, the principals' mean ratings were higher for desired involvement, indicating they wanted more counselor involvement in those areas.

Table 19 presents dependent t test results for the principals' responses to actual and desired involvement in inappropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 19

Comparison of Actual and Desired Involvements in Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Principals: Dependent t test

	Actual		Desired			
Inappropriate Tasks	M	SD	M	SD	N	t
Performing disciplinary actions	1.44	0.69	1.54	0.87	180	-2.32*
Assisting with duties in principal's office	2.07	1.00	2.13	1.06	179	-1.55
Maintaining student records	4.08	1.02	4.13	1.18	181	-.68
Registering and scheduling all new students	4.27	0.96	4.26	1.01	179	.23
Administering tests	4.06	1.13	4.07	1.13	180	-.08
Signing excuses for absent or tardy students	1.13	0.49	1.16	0.57	181	-.75
Teaching for absent teachers	1.04	0.21	1.16	0.53	180	-2.77**
Keeping clerical records	2.91	1.16	2.65	1.23	179	4.29**
Supervising study halls	1.04	0.35	1.05	0.29	171	-.35
Computing averages	3.38	1.56	3.35	1.60	178	.46
Sending students home for inappropriate dress	1.21	0.67	1.26	0.70	180	-.94

Note. A higher mean value represents greater involvement (1 = no involvement...5 = total involvement).

*$p \leq .05$. **$p \leq .01$.

Regarding inappropriate program tasks, principals' responses regarding actual and desired involvement yielded significant differences in three areas: performing disciplinary actions ($t = -2.34$, $p = .022$); teaching classes for absent teachers ($t = -2.77$; $p = .006$); and keeping clerical records ($t = 4.29$, $p = .000$). For performing disciplinary actions and teaching classes for absent teachers, the desired involvement mean values were slightly higher than the actual involvement means. However, both actual and desired involvement means were low in value representing little involvement in these counseling program tasks. Conversely, principals desired less involvement of counselors in keeping clerical records as evidenced by a lower mean value.

Research Question 6: Are there differences in the actual and desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by public secondary school counselors?

This research question sought to determine if there was a difference in actual and desired involvement in each of the 22 appropriate and inappropriate counseling program task areas as reported by secondary school counselors. A series of dependent t tests was used to compare counselors' actual and desired involvement responses on appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. All tests were conducted at the .05 level of significance.

Table 20 represents the dependent t test results for the counselors' actual and desired involvement responses to appropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 20

Comparison of Actual and Desired Involvements in Appropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Counselors: Dependent t test

	Actual		Desired			
Appropriate Tasks	M	SD	M	SD	N	t
Ensuring record maintenance	4.13	0.98	3.30	1.32	359	13.66**
Planning academic program	5.54	0.72	4.38	0.79	369	4.00**
Interpreting test results	3.90	1.01	3.81	1.01	373	2.32*
Assisting principal in identifying student needs	3.54	1.08	3.96	0.84	370	-7.81**
Suggestions to help teachers with study halls	1.29	0.69	1.52	0.98	342	-6.88**
Counseling tardy/absent students	2.99	0.97	2.98	1.01	371	.35
Collaborating with teachers	2.93	1.23	3.80	1.03	365	-15.53**
Counseling students with disciplinary problems	3.31	0.95	3.44	1.02	371	-2.80**
Counseling students about dress	2.22	1.06	2.05	1.07	372	4.79**
Interpreting student records	4.46	0.75	4.17	0.90	370	7.21**
Analyzing averages and relating to achievement	3.62	1.20	3.59	1.11	365	1.06

Note. A higher mean value represents greater involvement (1 = no involvement...5 = total involvement).

*$p \leq .05$. **$p \leq .01$.

Counselors' responses yielded two counseling program task areas with no significant differences between actual and desired involvement: counseling tardy and absent students ($t = .35$, $p = .728$) and analyzing grade point averages in relation to achievement ($t = 1.06$, $p = .288$). The results from the t test indicated significant differences between actual and desired involvement for all other counseling program tasks. In the counseling program task areas showing significant differences, four of the counselors' mean ratings were greater for desired involvement, including assisting the principal in identifying student needs, collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons, and counseling students with disciplinary problems. Suggestions to help teachers with study halls showed a higher mean rating for desired involvement, however this task area received low involvement ratings in both actual and desired.

Table 21 presents dependent t test results for the counselors' actual and desired involvement responses to inappropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 21

Comparison of Actual and Desired Involvements in Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Counselors: Dependent t test

	Actual		Desired			
Inappropriate Tasks	M	SD	M	SD	N	t
Performing disciplinary actions	1.63	0.82	1.31	0.60	374	9.10**
Assisting with duties in Principal's office	2.20	1.12	1.66	0.83	370	11.35**
Maintaining student records	4.02	1.14	3.08	1.36	373	14.73**
Registering and scheduling all new students	4.58	0.80	3.40	1.24	371	17.79**
Administering tests	4.00	1.25	3.15	1.23	370	13.40**
Signing excuses for absent or tardy students	1.35	0.80	1.13	0.44	377	6.27**
Teaching for absent teachers	1.12	0.42	1.07	0.33	376	2.26*
Keeping clerical records	3.25	1.27	1.86	0.92	365	22.23**
Supervising study halls	1.03	0.23	1.04	0.27	356	-.76
Computing averages	2.99	1.62	2.47	1.48	363	9.24**
Sending students home for inappropriate dress	1.29	0.78	1.13	0.52	371	4.81**

Note. A higher mean value represents greater involvement (1 = no involvement...5 = total involvement).

*$p \leq .05$. **$p \leq .01$.

The dependent t test revealed one counseling program task area, supervision of study halls ($t = -.76$, $p = .450$), that did not have a significant difference between actual and desired involvement as reported by secondary school counselors. All other inappropriate program tasks areas yielded significant differences between actual and desired involvement as reported by secondary school counselors. The counselors reported high levels of actual involvement in the inappropriate tasks of registering and scheduling all new students and in administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests; however in these task areas, the means for desired involvement were consistently lower than the actual involvement means.

Research Question 7: Are there differences between counselors' and principals' perceptions of actual involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks?

This research question sought to determine if there was a difference between the perceptions of principals and counselors in actual involvements of secondary school counselors in each of the 22 appropriate and inappropriate task areas. A series of independent t tests was used to compare counselors' actual involvement responses with principals' actual involvement responses on appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. All tests were conducted at the .05 level of significance.

Table 22 presents independent t test results for the counselors' and principals' actual involvement responses to appropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 22

Comparison of the Perceptions of Principals and Counselors in Actual Involvement of Counselors in Appropriate Counseling Program Tasks: Independent t test

	Principals			Counselors			
Appropriate Tasks	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	t
Ensuring record maintenance	4.21	0.93	182	4.15	0 .99	380	1.08
Planning academic program	4.30	0.79	181	4.55	0.72	386	-3.50**
Interpreting test results	3.92	1.06	181	3.90	1.01	386	0.14
Assisting principal in identifying student needs	3.49	1.00	182	3.56	1.08	382	-0.75
Suggestions to help teachers with study halls	1.25	0.64	172	1.32	0.75	358	-1.17
Counseling tardy or absent students	2.57	1.05	182	3.01	0.99	384	4.74**
Collaborating with teachers	3.14	1.16	179	2.91	1.25	381	2.05*
Counseling with disciplinary problems	2.98	1.02	182	3.32	0.96	385	3.93
Counseling students about dress	2.19	1.14	182	2.26	1.09	383	-0.64
Interpreting student records	4.30	0.89	182	4.47	0.75	386	-2.18*
Analyzing averages and relating to achievement	3.76	1.17	182	3.66	1.20	379	0.99

*$p \leq .05$. **$p \leq .01$.

Independent t test results indicated significant differences between secondary school principals' and secondary school counselors' responses about actual involvements in the following appropriate counseling program tasks: planning individual student's academic programs ($t = -3.50$, $p = .001$), counseling with tardy or absent students ($t = 4.74$, $p < .001$), collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons ($t = 2.05$, $p = .041$), counseling students with disciplinary problems ($t = -3.93$, $p < .001$), and interpreting student records ($t = -2.18$, $p = .030$). In each of the appropriate tasks, except for collaborating with teachers, the counselor mean ratings for actual involvement were higher than those of the principals.

Table 23 presents independent t test results for the counselors' and principals' actual involvement responses to inappropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 23

Comparison of the Perceptions of Principals and Counselors in Actual Involvement of Counselors in Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks: Independent t test

	Principals			Counselors			
Inappropriate Tasks	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	t
Performing disciplinary actions	1.44	0.68	182	1.64	0.82	385	-3.07**
Assisting with duties in principal's office	2.06	1.00	181	2.20	0.82	382	-1.50
Maintaining student records	4.09	1.02	182	4.04	1.14	385	0.52
Registering and scheduling new students	4.28	0.96	180	4.58	0.81	385	-3.65**
Administering tests	4.07	1.13	181	4.02	1.24	384	0.44
Signing excuses for absent or tardy students	1.13	0.49	182	1.36	0.81	387	-4.23**
Teaching when teachers absent	1.05	0.22	182	1.12	0.41	386	-2.53*
Keeping clerical records	2.91	1.18	181	3.26	1.28	378	-3.20**
Supervising study halls	1.04	0.35	173	1.05	0.31	368	-0.19
Computing averages	3.36	1.57	179	3.02	1.62	378	2.33*
Sending students home for inappropriate dress	1.21	0.67	181	1.29	0.79	384	-1.28

*$p \leq .05$. **$p \leq .01$.

Independent t test results indicated significant differences between secondary school principals and secondary school counselors' actual involvements in the following inappropriate counseling program tasks: performing disciplinary actions ($t = -3.07$, $p = .002$), registering and scheduling all new students ($t = -3.65$, $p = .000$), signing excuses for absent or tardy students ($t = -4.28$, $p < .001$), teaching for absent teachers ($t = -2.53$, $p = .012$), keeping clerical records ($t = -3.20$, $p = .001$), and computing grade point averages ($t = 2.33$, $p = .020$). In each of the inappropriate tasks, except for computing grade point averages, the counselors' mean ratings for actual involvement were higher than those of the principals.

Research Question 8: Are there differences between counselors' and principals' perceptions of desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks?

This research question sought to determine if there was a difference between the perceptions of principals and counselors in desired involvements of secondary school counselors in each of the 22 appropriate and inappropriate task areas. A series of independent t tests was used to compare counselors' desired involvement responses with principals' desired involvement responses on appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. All tests were conducted at the .05 level of significance.

Table 24 presents independent t test results for the counselors' and principals' desired involvement responses to appropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 24

Comparison of the Perceptions of Principals and Counselors in Desired Involvement of Counselors in Appropriate Counseling Program Tasks: Independent t Test

	Principals			Counselors			
Appropriate Tasks	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	t
Ensuring record maintenance	4.33	1.01	186	3.32	1.32	365	9.95**
Planning academic program	4.58	0.67	186	4.38	0.79	375	2.99**
Interpreting test results	4.45	0.76	184	3.82	1.01	379	8.26**
Assisting principal in identifying student needs	4.01	0.86	186	3.96	0.84	378	0.63
Suggestions to help teachers with study halls	1.45	0.93	174	1.51	0.98	348	-0.61
Counseling tardy or absent students	3.22	1.17	184	2.97	1.01	378	2.48*
Collaborating with teachers	3.89	0.97	184	3.79	1.03	372	1.05
Counseling students with disciplinary problems	3.75	0.99	186	3.43	1.02	377	3.55**
Counseling students about dress	2.51	1.27	186	2.04	1.06	380	4.35**
Interpreting student records	4.52	0.74	186	4.18	0.90	376	4.75**
Analyzing averages and relating to achievement	4.15	0.98	186	3.60	1.11	372	5.98**

*$p \leq .05$. **$p \leq .01$.

Independent t test results indicated significant differences between secondary school principals and secondary school counselors desired involvements in all of the appropriate counseling program tasks, with three exceptions: assisting principals in identifying student needs ($t = .63$, $p = .527$), providing teachers with suggestions for managing study halls ($t = -.61$, $p = .541$), and collaborating with teachers to provide guidance curriculum lessons ($t = 1.05$, $p = .295$). In each of the appropriate tasks, except providing teachers with suggestions for better management of study halls, the principals' mean ratings for desired involvement were higher than those of the counselors.

Table 25 presents independent t test results for the counselors' and principals' desired involvement responses to inappropriate counseling program tasks.

Table 25

Comparison of the Perceptions of Principals and Counselors in Desired Involvement of Counselors in Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks: Independent t test

	Principals			Counselors			
Inappropriate Tasks	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	t
Performing disciplinary actions	1.54	0.86	185	1.31	0.60	380	3.15**
Assisting with duties in principal's office	2.13	1.07	184	1.67	0.84	377	5.06**
Maintaining student records	4.12	1.18	186	3.10	1.36	379	9.21**
Registering and scheduling new students	4.23	1.03	184	3.42	1.24	377	8.19**
Administering tests	4.07	1.11	185	3.16	1.24	378	8.42**
Signing excuses for absent or tardy students	1.16	0.56	186	1.13	0.43	383	0.71
Teaching when teachers are absent	1.15	0.52	185	1.07	0.32	382	2.00*
Keeping clerical records	2.62	1.23	184	1.89	0.96	372	7.05**
Supervising study halls	1.05	0.29	175	1.04	0.26	362	0.29
Computing averages	3.36	1.59	183	2.48	1.48	372	6.24**
Sending students home for inappropriate dress	1.26	0.71	185	1.13	0.51	379	2.19*

*$p \leq .05$. **$p \leq .01$.

Independent t test results indicated significant differences between secondary school principals and secondary school counselors desired involvements in all of the inappropriate counseling program tasks, with two exceptions: signing excuses for students who are absent or tardy ($t = .713$, $p = .476$) and supervising study halls ($t = .288$, $p = .774$). In all of the inappropriate counseling program tasks, the principals' mean ratings for desired involvement were higher than the counselors.

Summary

This study investigated the actual and desired levels of involvement of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by secondary school principals and secondary school counselors in public schools in Georgia. The 22 task items were identified in the American School Counselor Association's publication, Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). To report the actual and desired involvements of secondary school counselors in the appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks, the responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics. To analyze differences in responses between and within the counselors and principals, a series of dependent and independent t tests were utilized.

Secondary school principals reported much or total actual involvement of counselors in the appropriate counseling program tasks of planning individual student's academic program, interpreting student records, ensuring that student records are maintained as per state and federal legislation, interpreting cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests, and analyzing grade point averages in relationship to achievement. Principals also reported much or total actual involvement of counselors in the

inappropriate counseling program tasks of registering and scheduling all new students; maintaining student records; administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests; and computing grade point averages.

Secondary school counselors reported much or total involvement in the appropriate counseling program task areas of planning individual student's academic program; interpreting student records; ensuring that student records are maintained as per state and federal legislation; interpreting cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests; analyzing grade point averages in relationship to achievement; and assisting the principal in identifying student needs. Counselors also reported much and total actual involvement in the inappropriate counseling program task areas of registering and scheduling of all new students; maintaining student records; and administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests.

Much and total desired involvement of counselors were reported by principals in the appropriate task areas of planning individual student's academic program; interpreting student records; interpreting cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests; ensuring that student records are maintained as per state and federal legislation; analyzing grade point averages in regards to achievement; assisting the principal in identifying student needs; collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons; and counseling students who have disciplinary problems. Much and total desired involvement of counselors were reported by principals in the inappropriate counseling program task areas of maintaining student records; registering and scheduling all new students; and administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests.

Much and total desired involvement were reported by counselors in the appropriate counseling program task areas of planning individual student's academic program; interpreting student records; assisting the principal with identifying student needs; collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons; and interpreting cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests. Much and total desired involvement were reported by counselors in the inappropriate counseling program task areas of registering and scheduling all new students; maintaining student records; and administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests.

In the appropriate counseling program task area of ensuring record maintenance, principals' responses were significantly different as to actual and desired involvement of counselors. Regarding inappropriate program tasks, principals' actual and desired involvement responses yielded significant differences in three areas: performing discipline actions, teaching classes for absent teachers, and keeping clerical records.

With the exception of two appropriate counseling program task areas, counseling tardy and absent students and analyzing grade point averages in relation to achievement, all task areas were significantly different in regard to counselors' responses of actual and desired involvements. In the inappropriate counseling program tasks, only one area, supervision of study halls, did not show significant difference between actual and desired involvements as reported by secondary school counselors.

Secondary school principals and secondary school counselors differed significantly on their reporting of actual involvements in the appropriate counseling program tasks areas of planning individual student's academic programs, counseling with tardy or absent students, collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons,

counseling students with disciplinary problems, and interpreting student records. On inappropriate counseling program tasks, counselors and principals differed significantly on the following areas: performing disciplinary actions, registering and scheduling all new students, signing excuses for absent or tardy students, teaching for absent teachers, keeping clerical records, and computing grade point averages.

Desired involvements in appropriate counseling program tasks were significantly different between secondary school principals and secondary school counselors in all tasks except assisting principals in identifying student needs, providing teachers with suggestions for managing study halls, and collaborating with teachers to provide guidance curriculum lessons. In the inappropriate counseling program task areas, significant differences between counselors and principals were found in all tasks except for signing excuses for students who are absent or tardy and supervising study halls.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this research was to determine if the perceptions of public secondary school principals and counselors differed as to actual and desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. The counseling program tasks used for this study were specified in Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs, a publication of the American School Counselor Association (Campbell & Dahir, 1997).

Two survey instruments were developed using the appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as listed in the publication by the American School Counselor Association. The two versions of the instrument differed only in the demographic questions. The principals' version of the survey instrument (Appendix D) was mailed to 264 secondary school principals in public schools in Georgia. The survey instrument for counselors (Appendix E) was mailed to 650 secondary school counselors in public schools in Georgia. Survey responses were returned from 187 principals and from 393 counselors.

From the demographic data collected, the majority of principals and counselors indicated that tasks were assigned to counselors by the principals. These findings support the literature reviewed that indicated principals were usually the ones to assign tasks to counselors (Ballard, 1995; Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999; Cassese, 1969; Coy, 1991, 1999; Goodnough, 1995; Hentsch, 1996; Johnson, 1989; and Sears, 1999).

On the survey instrument, a Likert rating of four was used to indicate much involvement in counseling program tasks. Tasks on which principals and counselors reported mean Likert values of four or greater are shown on table 26 and table 27. Table 26 summarizes the appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks that had mean values of four or greater for actual and desired involvement of school counselors as reported by secondary school principals. Table 27 summarizes the appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks that had mean values of four or greater for actual and desired involvement of school counselors as reported by secondary school counselors.

Table 26

Summary of Much Actual and Much Desired Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Appropriate and Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Principals

Tasks	Principals' Actual	Principals' Desired
Appropriate	Planning academic programs	Planning academic programs
	Interpreting student records	Interpreting student records
	Ensuring record maintenance	Ensuring record maintenance
		Interpreting test results
		Analyzing grade point averages in relation to achievement
		Assisting administration in identifying student needs
Inappropriate	Registering and scheduling of all new students	Registering and scheduling all new students
	Maintaining student records	Maintaining student records
	Administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	Administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests

Table 27

Summary of Much Actual and Much Desired Involvement of Secondary School Counselors in Appropriate and Inappropriate Counseling Program Tasks as Reported by Secondary School Counselors

Tasks	Counselors' Actual	Counselors' Desired
Appropriate	Planning academic programs	Planning academic programs
	Interpreting student records	Interpreting student records
	Ensuring record maintenance	Assisting administration in identifying student needs
Inappropriate	Registering and scheduling all new students	
	Maintaining student records	
	Administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	

Note. No mean Likert ratings of four or greater (much desired involvement) in inappropriate counseling program tasks were obtained for counselors.

Discussion of Research Findings

Principals' and counselors' responses to the first four research questions were analyzed to determine the actual and desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. The research findings of this study as discussed in this section reflect the concerns of Ballard (1995), Dahir (1997), McDowell (1995), and Miller (1998) who cautioned that the assignment of administrative, clerical, and testing tasks to counselors was not only inappropriate, but also contributed to the lack of comprehensive developmental counseling programs.

Both principals and counselors had mean ratings of much actual involvement and much desired involvement of counselors in the appropriate counseling program task areas of planning individual student's academic program, ensuring record maintenance, and interpreting student records. In addition, principals also desired much involvement of counselors in ensuring record maintenance, interpreting test results, and analyzing grade point averages in relation to achievement. Much involvement in these tasks supported Sears' (1999) assertion that counselors become more involved in the area of improving student achievement. These findings also supported Stanciak (1995) who pointed out that counselors should foster success and productivity for all students.

In the inappropriate counseling program task areas, principals and counselors had mean ratings of much actual counselor involvement in registering and scheduling all new students, maintaining student records, and administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests. In addition, principals reported much desired involvement in the same inappropriate counseling program tasks area, but counselors did not report much desired involvement in any of the inappropriate counseling program tasks. The involvement of

counselors in these inappropriate counseling program tasks supported Sears' (1999) charge that the assignment of "administrivia" to counselors would hinder counselors in performing tasks that would aid in student achievement. The findings from this study also supported other research that reported the involvement of counselors in inappropriate counseling program tasks (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Cole, 1991; Freeman & Coll, 1997; Giddings, 1998; Stalling, 1991). The results from this study could support Henry (1989), who charged that principals assigned inappropriate tasks to counselors because principals did not know what counselors should be doing. The results from this study reporting principals desiring much involvement and counselors not desiring much involvement in inappropriate tasks supported Kaplan (1995) and Topor (1997) who promoted the idea that counselors should be leaders for determining their roles and should function as change agents with their administrators to provide effective counseling programs for their schools.

Question five examined the differences between actual involvement and desired involvement of counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by principals. In the appropriate counseling program task of ensuring record maintenance, no significant difference was found between the responses of principals for actual involvement and desired involvement. The other ten appropriate counseling program tasks indicated principals' responses were significantly different in actual involvement and in desired involvement. In all of the significantly different tasks, the principals' mean rating was higher for desired involvement than for actual involvement, indicating the principals wanted more counselor involvement in all areas other than ensuring record maintenance. This finding that indicated that principals desired more counselor involvement in appropriate tasks supported the work of Goodnough (1995).

Goodnough observed that principals had high expectations of counselor performance in professional tasks.

In the inappropriate counseling program tasks, principals' responses yielded significant differences between actual involvement and desired involvement in performing disciplinary actions, teaching classes for absent teachers, and keeping clerical records. The mean values were slightly higher for desired involvement than for actual involvement in performing disciplinary actions and teaching classes for absent students, however, these mean values were low indicating little actual or desired involvement in these tasks. The lower desired value for the task of keeping clerical records, indicated the principals desired less counselor involvement in that area. These results again reflect the fact that principals desire counselors' involvements in administrative and clerical tasks as suggested by Ballard (1995), Dahir (1997), Giddings (1998), McDowell (1995), and Miller (1998). In 1996, a committee representing the Georgia School Counselors Association presented recommendations on the needs and roles of school counselors to the state school superintendent. Clerical and administrative tasks were cited as barriers to appropriate school counselor roles (Bergin et al., 1996).

Question six analyzed the differences between actual and desired involvement of counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks as reported by counselors. Counselors reported no significant differences in the appropriate counseling program tasks of counseling absent or tardy students and analyzing grade point averages in relation to achievement. In the other nine appropriate counseling program tasks counselors were significantly different in reporting actual and desired involvements. Counselors showed higher desired mean ratings than actual mean ratings in the tasks of:

assisting the principal in identifying student needs, collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons, counseling students with discipline problems, and providing teachers with suggestions for better management of study halls. The higher desired mean ratings for these tasks buttress Bergin and others (1996) who described counseling roles as including consultation, coordination, counseling, and developmental guidance. These results also support Campbell and Dahir (1997) who incorporate counseling, consultation, collaboration, coordination, case management, guidance curriculum, and program evaluation in the components for school counseling programs.

In the inappropriate counseling program tasks, supervising study halls was the only task that showed no significant difference between the counselors' reporting of actual involvement and desired involvement. All other inappropriate counseling program tasks were not only significantly different, but the mean of all inappropriate task areas was higher in actual involvement than in desired involvement. This indicated counselors did not desire to be involved in inappropriate counseling program tasks. This evidence of counselors' desires not to be involved in inappropriate counseling program tasks, aligns with Mariani (1998) who contended that counselors who were not restricted by inappropriate tasks could create effective comprehensive developmental guidance and counseling programs. This finding also supports a similar message from Campbell and Dahir (1997) who stated that in order for counselors to be able to deliver comprehensive developmental counseling programs, their services should be limited to achieving the goals directly related to the counseling program.

Question seven was investigated to see if there were differences between principals' and counselors' reports of actual involvement of school counselors in

appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. Significant differences in actual involvement in appropriate counseling program tasks were found to exist between principals and counselors in the following appropriate counseling program tasks: planning individual student's academic program, counseling absent and tardy students, collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons, counseling students with discipline problems, and interpreting student records. In all of these areas, except collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons, the mean rating for actual involvement for counselors was higher than the mean rating for principals, indicating that counselors saw themselves with greater actual involvement than the principals. This finding implied that counselors do see working with students to improve achievement (Sears, 1999) as a counseling goal of great importance.

In the inappropriate counseling program tasks, there were significant differences between the principals and the counselors in actual involvement in the following areas: performing disciplinary actions, registering and scheduling all new students, signing excuses for tardy or absent students, teaching for absent teachers, keeping clerical records, and computing grade point averages. In all of these areas, except computing grade point averages, the counselors' mean ratings for actual involvement were higher than the principals' ratings, indicating that counselors saw themselves more involved in inappropriate counseling program tasks than principals. The indication from this analysis supports Stalling (1991) who cited from the Georgia Department of Education stating that secondary school counselors were often performing inappropriate tasks, such as performing administrative and clerical tasks. Coy (1999) emphasized the importance of

using the expertise of counselors for comprehensive developmental counseling programs rather than misusing their time for clerical and administrative tasks.

The eighth and final research question investigated the differences between principals and counselors reporting of desired involvement in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. In the appropriate counseling program tasks, all areas except three showed significant differences between the principals and counselors. The three tasks showing no significant differences were: assisting the principal in identifying student needs, providing teachers with suggestions for better management of study halls, and collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons. In each counseling program task, except providing teachers with suggestions for better management of study halls, the principals' mean rating for desired involvement was higher than the counselors. The higher mean ratings indicated principals desired more involvement of counselors in those task areas. Since earlier research reported the assignment of duties to counselors by principals (Ballard, 1995; Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999; Cassese, 1969; Coy, 1991, 1999; Goodnough, 1995; Johnson, 1989, Miller, 1998; Murray, 1995; Napierkowski & Parsons, 1995; Oshiro, 1980; Sears, 1999), the results of this study would indicate that principals assign the tasks in which they desire much involvement of counselors.

In the inappropriate counseling program tasks, only two areas showed no significant differences between principals and counselors in desired involvement of counselors: signing excuses for tardy or absent students and supervising study halls. In all the inappropriate counseling program tasks, principals' mean ratings were higher than counselors, indicating their desire for more counselor involvement in the inappropriate

counseling program tasks. These findings support the study by Henry (1989) who stated that principals often assigned inappropriate tasks to counselors because they did not know what counselors should be doing. It also gives support to Matthay (1988) who suggested that principals need instruction in counselor education.

Conclusions

This study investigated the actual and desired involvements of public secondary school counselors in Georgia in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. The tasks were those presented in Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs. Based on the responses from secondary principals and counselors who participated in this study, several conclusions can be noted.

Results from this study indicated that principals were most often the ones to assign tasks to counselors. Responses from both principals and counselors showed majority responses to this demographic item.

The data analysis of this study indicated that both secondary school principals and counselors perceived counselors to be actually involved in both appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. Principals also desired counselors to be involved in both appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks. Counselors, however, desired involvement in appropriate counseling program tasks, but did not desire involvement in inappropriate counseling program tasks.

These responses indicated principals not only assign inappropriate tasks to counselors, but they also desire counselor involvement in these inappropriate counseling program tasks. Another conclusion that can be drawn from this analysis is that counselors

do not desire to be involved in inappropriate tasks, but actually perform them because they are assigned these tasks.

Implications

Principals are most often the ones to assign tasks to counselors. This fact is established in the literature (Dahir, 1997: Henderson, 1994; Hentsch, 1996; Johnson, 1989; Lampe, 1985: Matthay, 1988) and supported by this research study. This would serve as an implication that in order to promote effective comprehensive developmental counseling programs in secondary schools, principals need to be better prepared to make appropriate use of counselors in their schools.

Interestingly, principals are also the supervisors and evaluators of counselors. As supervisors of counselors, Hentsch (1996) implied that they are also the major source of support for counseling programs. Principals must work with counselors from a knowledge base of what a comprehensive developmental counseling program involves. Principals and counselors must improve communication with one another and develop working relationships with program goals as their driving force.

Counselors must also share in the responsibility for developing effective comprehensive developmental counseling programs in their schools. Ballard (1995), Dwyer (1979), and Murray (1995) documented the importance of counselor advocacy for their counseling programs. Counselors must be proactive in communicating their roles to stakeholders in their schools. They must be accountable for developing and implementing comprehensive developmental guidance programs that meet the needs of their students. An implication for counselor preparation programs would be to promote advocacy in their

counseling education curriculum and to encourage their students to be proactive in their schools and in counseling organizations.

If secondary school counseling programs are essential to the entire school as asserted by Thompson (1986) and Myricks (1997), counselors and principals must work together to develop and implement comprehensive developmental counseling programs that meet the needs of their students. With a plan in place, counselors must be empowered to deliver the planned program (Murray, 1995) and must not be encumbered with tasks inappropriate to the goals of the counseling program.

Students of today have special needs (Ballard, 1995; Myricks, 1997; Stanciak, 1995). The implication is for counseling programs in secondary schools to be designed and developed to meet the specific needs of the students they serve. Students are the primary benefactors of effective comprehensive developmental guidance and counseling programs which are not only limited to secondary schools, but are available to students in all schools in the system.

This study clearly points out that counselors in public secondary schools in Georgia are involved in inappropriate counseling program tasks. These Georgia counselors may be unaware of the tasks as noted in Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs, they may not agree with these tasks, or they may be fulfilling tasks as expected of them by their principals . A final implication from this study would be for counselors to participate actively in state and national counselor organizations and to apprize or involve their principals in the activities of these organizations. Principals and counselors should read and be familiar with Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs published by the

American School Counselor Association. Not only are the appropriate and inappropriate tasks defined, the publication presents guidelines for developing comprehensive developmental counseling programs. Counselors and principals should know the national standards, which are statements of what students should know and be able to do as a result of participating in school counseling programs.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. All secondary school principals receive specific education, either in the form of in-service or formal course work, on the proper use of counselors in secondary schools.
2. Clerical help is assigned to secondary school counselors.
3. Counselors become proactive in promoting comprehensive developmental counseling programs.
4. Counselors should be empowered by principals to develop, implement, and evaluate counseling programs in their schools.
5. Counselors and principals should frequently and openly communicate with each other seeking to continuously improve counseling services to their stakeholders.
6. Counselors should actively participate in state and national professional organizations.

7. Counselors should keep principals abreast of current research and recommendations for the improvement of secondary school counseling programs.

Recommendations for future research:

1. A follow-up study could be conducted in a few years to see if the American School Counselor's publication of the national standards has fostered any changes in the actual and desired involvements of secondary school counselors in appropriate and inappropriate counseling program tasks.
2. The study could be replicated in another state and the findings compared to the findings of this Georgia study.
3. The study could be replicated in elementary and middle schools. The findings could be compared to this study to determine if task assignments differed across grade levels.
4. A qualitative study could examine the tasks of counselors through ethnographic measures.
5. A quantitative study could examine the affect of demographic variables such as school size, location, population served, etc. on tasks performed by secondary school counselors.

References

Anderson, J. (1994, April). Annual evaluation of school counselors in Georgia. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Anderson, J. (1995). Evaluating school counselors: The state of the art in Georgia. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, *9*(2), 139-157.

Ballard, M. B. (1995). The perceived roles, functions, and training needs of school counselors (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Orleans, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56, 10A: 3825.

Ballard, M. B., & Murgatroyd, W. (1999). Defending a vital program: School counselors define their roles. NASSP Bulletin, 82(603), 19-25.

Banks, J. W. (1994). Integrated curriculum for restructuring public education. Computing Teacher, 21, 17-20.

Barletta, J. (1995). Legal and ethical issues for school counselors: Supervision as a safeguard. Athens, OH: Ohio University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 379 577)

Beale, A. V. (1995). Selecting school counselors: The principal's perspective. The School Counselor, 42, 211-217.

Bergin, J. J. (1998, October). Georgia Southern University: Focus on school counselor training program in Georgia continues. Beacon, 6.

Bergin, J. J., Cutts, B. J., Little, G., Cowart, B., Fuchs, N., Day, C., Bridges, B., Guinn, M., & Broadhurst, M. (1996, May). Recommendations from the role and needs of school counselors committee to Mrs. Schrenko. Beacon, 21-23.

Boley, E. (1994). Restructuring: School counselors can make a difference. Turlock, CA: California State University, Stanislaus. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 367 920)

Burtnett, F. (1993). Let's bump counseling off the back burner of reform. Education Digest, 59(2), 51-54.

Campbell, C. A., & Dahir, C. A. (1997). Sharing the vision: The national standards for school counseling programs. Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association.

Carroll, B. W. (1993). Perceived roles and preparation experiences of elementary counselors: Suggestions for change. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 27, 216-225.

Cassese, T. M. (1969). Perceptions of the actual and ideal roles of the secondary school counselor reported by selected school personnel in Florida (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 30, 05A:1813.

Children's Defense Fund (1998, April 28). Every day in America [On-line]. Available: http://www.childrensdefense.org/states/data_us.html

Cole, C. G. (1991). Counselors and administrators: A comparison of roles. *NAASP Bulletin, 75*(534), 5-13.

Coll, K. M., & Freeman, B. (1997). Role conflict among elementary school counselors: A national comparison with middle and secondary school counselors. Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 31, 251-261.

Coy, D. R. (1991). The role of the counselor in today's school. NAASP Bulletin, 75(534), 15-19.

Coy, D. R. (1999). The role and training of the school counselor: Background and purpose. NASSP Bulletin, 82(603), 2-8.

Cromwell, R. R. (1991). Key supervision skills that will touch the future of school reform. Richmond, IN: Indiana University East. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 352 355)

Crutchfield, L. B. (1998, February). Columbus State University: Focus on school counselor training programs in Georgia continues. Beacon, 11.

Daft, R. L. (1995). Organization theory and design (5th ed.). St.Paul: West.

Dahir, C. A. (1997). Supporting a nation of learners: Development of national standards for school counseling programs (Doctoral dissertation, Hofstra University, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58, 08A: 3017.

Drury, S. S. (1984, January). Counselor survival in the 1980s. The School Counselor, 31, 234-240.

Dwyer, E. J. (1979). The role of the secondary school counselor in Maine as described by superintendents, secondary school principals, secondary school counselors, and secondary school teachers (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 01A: 0037.

Evans, D. L. (1992). The "instructional leader" must go. Irvine, CA: University of California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 024 296)

Frank, R. L. (1986). Counselor administrator perceptions of counselor responsibilities. Los Angeles, CA: Annual Convention of the American Association for Counseling and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 2270 705)

Freeman, B., & Coll, K. M. (1997, April). Factor structure of the role questionnaire (rq): A study of high school counselors. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 30, 32-39.

Georgia Department of Education (1984). Secondary school counseling job description: Georgia comprehensive guidance. Office of Planning and Development, Atlanta, GA.

Georgia Department of Education (1989). Job description for Georgia school counselors. Student Support Services Unit, Division of Program Development and Student Support, Office of Instructional Programs, Atlanta, GA.

Georgia Department of Education (1991). Georgia School Counselor Evaluation Program. Performance Assessment Laboratory, College of Education, The University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

Georgia Department of Education (1999). Office of Technology Services--School Directory [Online]. Available: http://dbl.doe.k12.ga.us:8001/ows-bin/owa/school_main.fill_form

Gerler, E. R. (1992). What we know about school counseling: A reaction to Borders and Drury. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70 (4), 499-501.

Getzels, J. W., Lipham, J. M., & Campbell, R. F. (1968). Educational administration as a social process: Theory, research, practice. New York: Harper & Row.

Giddings, C. M. (1998). But when will I counsel? Georgia School Counselor Association Journal, 1(5), 18-22.

Goldring, E. & Chen, M. (1992). Preparing empowered teachers for leadership. Planning and Changing, 23(1), 3-14.

Goodnough, G. E. (1995). Locus of control, occupational commitment and principal expectations as predictors of professional task behavior and effective performance of secondary school counselors (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56, 09A: 3457.

Gorton, R., & Ohlemacher, R. (1987). Counselor Evaluation: A new priority for the principal's agenda. NAASP Bulletin, 71(496), 120-124.

Greer, M. T. (1995). A definition of "restructuring": A study of the perceptions of school principals, state school officers, and authors of articles and books on restructuring (Doctoral dissertation, New Mexico State University, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts International, 57, 01A: 0048.

Greer, R. M., & Richardson, M. D. (1992, November). Restructuring the guidance delivery system: Implications for high school counselors. The School Counselor, 40, 93-96.

Guerra, P. (1998, February). Revamping school counselor education: The DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund. Counseling Today, 40, 19, 36.

Gysbers, N. C. (1995). Evaluating school guidance programs. Greensboro, NC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Student Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 388 887)

Harlan, F. J. (1980). Pupil services administrator leadership style and subordinate job satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 09A: 3804.

Haskew, L. D. (1934). The status of guidance in Georgia high schools. (Masters dissertation, The University of Chicago, 1934). Dissertation Abstracts International, ADD, S0330.

Henderson, P. (1994). Supervision of school counselors. ERIC Digest [On-line], 1-4. Available: http://www.uncg.edu/ericcass/supervisory/dig21.html

Henderson, P., & Lampe, R.E. (1992). Clinical supervision of school counselors. School Counselor, 39(3), 151-157.

Henry, D. G. (1989). An ethnographic study of the perceived interpersonal relationships between secondary school principals and counselors (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 05A: 1218.

Hentsch, L. D. (1996). A comparative evaluation of the importance of roles and functions of secondary school counselors as perceived by school counselors, school

principals, and counselor educators (Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, 57, 10A: 4273.

Herndon, E. H. (1990). Legal aspects of the role of the public school counselor in North Carolina (Doctoral dissertation, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 51, 09A: 2985.

Hoyt, K. B. (1993). Guidance is not a dirty word. School Counselor, 40(4), 267-273.

Huck, S. W. & Cormier, W. H. (1996). Reading statistics and research. New York: HarperCollins.

Huey, W. C. (1987). The principal-counselor partnership: A winning combination. NASSP Bulletin, 71(499), 14-16, 18.

Iacocca, L. (1991). The centennial essay. American School Board Journal, 178(1), 21-22.

Johnson, T. H. (1989). An analysis of senior high school guidance counselor role perceptions and expectations by high school principals and guidance counselors in Florida school districts (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 07A: 1872.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Kaplan, L. S. (1995, March). Principals versus counselors: Resolving tensions from different practice. The School Counselor, 42, 261-267.

Lampe, H. E. (1985). Principals' training in counseling and development: A national survey. Counselor Education and Supervision, 25(1), 44-47.

Lawton, M. (1998, April 29). Split personality. Education Week,17(33), 31-36.

Lunenburg, F. C. (1998). Techniques in the supervision of teachers: Preservice and inservice applications. Education, 118(4), 521.

Mariani, M. (1998). National standards for school counseling programs: New direction, new promise. Occupational Outlook Quarterly, 42(3), 41-42.

Matthay, E. R. (1988). A study of school counselor evaluation procedures. School Counselor, 35(5), 383-393.

McDowell, D. K. (1995, May). Role perception study of school counselors. Huntsville, TX: Sam Houston State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 388 909)

Miller, T. K. (1998). Secondary school counselor survey report. Alexandria, VA: National Association for College Admission Counseling.

Murphy, J. (1993). What's in? What's out? American education in the nineties. Phi Delta Kappan, 74, 641-646.

Murray, B. A. (1995). Principals: Proponents of high school guidance programs. NASSP Bulletin, 79(570), 64-68.

Murray, B. A. (1995). Validating the role of the school counselor. School Counselor, 43 (1), 5-9.

Myrick, R. D. (1997). Developmental guidance and counseling: A practical approach. (3rd ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media Corporation.

Napierkowski, C. M., & Parsons, R. D. (1995, May). Diffusion of innovation: Implementing changes in school counselor roles and functions. The School Counselor, 42, 364-369.

Nidds, J. A., & McGerald, J. (1995). Corporate America looks at public education. Principal, 74(4), 22-23.

Northouse, P. (1997). Leadership theory and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

O'Bryant, B. J. (1991). Getting the most from your school counseling program. NAASP Bulletin, 75(534), 1-4.

O'Dell, F. L., Rak, C. F., Chermonte, J. P., Hamlin, A., & Waina, N. (1996). Guidance for the 1990s: Revitalizing the counselor's role. The Clearing House, 69, 303-307.

Ornstein, A. C. (1993). Leaders and losers: How principals succeed. Education Digest, 59(4), 27-30.

Oshiro, C. T. (1980). An analysis of the actual and ideal role concepts of secondary school counselors in a large metropolitan school district (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 07A: 2941.

Paisley, P. O., & Borders, D. (1995). School counseling: An evolving specialty. Journal of Counseling & Development, 74(2), p. 150-153.

Patterson, C. H. (1971). An introduction to counseling in the school. New York: Harper & Row.

Paul, L. (1994). The new American schools: What will they be like in the year 2000? NAASP Bulletin, 78(564), 41-45.

Polite, M. (1993, April). Leadership and change: Working toward a paradigm shift. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Reichert, R. B. (1974). A comparative study of attitudes of secondary school administrators, professors of educational administration, secondary school counselors, counselors supervisors, and counselor educators toward the role of the secondary school counselor (Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 85, 09A: 5829.

Riley, M. N. (1991). Princi[illegible]s must empower teachers. NAASP Bulletin, 75(534), 4.

Ripley, V. V. (1996). Principals' perceptions of the supervision of school counselors (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1996). Dissertation abstracts International, 57, 08A: 3406

Roberts, E. B., & Borders, L. D. (1994, January). Supervision of school counselors: Administrative, program, and counseling. The School Counselor, 41, 149-157.

Robbins, J. H. (1993). Testimony before NEC on T and L. Ypsilanti, MI: NECTL.

Ross, T. W., & Bailey, G. D. (1994). Wanted: A new literacy for the information age. NASSP Bulletin, 78(563), 31-35.

Schalesky, D. E. (1993). A local study of the roles and functions of the secondary school counselor. Hays, KS: Master's Thesis. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 359 464)

Sears, S. (1999). Transforming school counseling: Making a difference for students. NASSP Bulletin, 82(603), 47-53.

Shavelson, R. J. (1996). Statistical Reasoning for the Behavorial Sciences (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Shumake, G. F. (1964). The role and function of the school counselor in Georgia secondary schools as perceived by principals and counselors (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Georgia, 1965). Dissertation Abstracts International, 25, 05: 2818.

Stalling, J. E. (1991). The role of the school counselor as perceived by school counselors, principals and superintendents (Doctoral dissertation, The University of South Dakota, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 07A: 2416.

Stanciak, L. A. (1995). Reforming the high school counselor's role: A look at developmental guidance. NASSP Bulletin, 79*(570)*, 60-63.

Stevenson, M. Y. (1990). Identification and comparison of role expectations, role conceptions, and role performances to clarify the role of the high school counselor (Doctoral dissertation, University of Montana, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 51, 07A: 2271.

Suter, W. N. (1998). Primer of Educational Research. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Tennyson, W. W., Miller, G. D., Skovholt, T. M., & Williams, R. C. (1989). How they view their role: A survey of counselors in different secondary schools. Journal of Counseling and Development, 67(7), 399-403.

Terrill, J. L. (1990). Toward the 1990s: Emerging themes in school counseling. NASSP Bulletin, 74 (527), 84-88.

Thomas, R. J., & Hutchinson, R. L. (1992). Meeting students' needs: Counselors' changing roles. Muncie, IN: Ball State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 347 082)

Thompson, R. A. (1986). A comparison of counselor, principal, and teacher perceptions of the role and function of the school counselor in Virginia public secondary schools (Doctoral dissertation, The College of William and Mary In Virginia, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 09A: 3318.

Topor, E. A. (1997). School counseling 2000: A profession at risk (Doctoral dissertation, The Claremont Graduate School, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58, 05A: 1605.

Wallace, R. (1999, May). Albany State University: College of education master of education degree program. Beacon, 7.

Whitaker, K. S., & Moses, M. C. (1990). Teacher empowerment: A key to restructuring. The Clearinghouse, 64(1), 127-130.

Yukl, G. (1998). Leadership in organizations. (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Children's Defense Fund

Everyday in America:

3 young people under age 25 die from HIV infection.

6 children commit suicide.

13 children are homicide victims.

14 children are killed by firearms.

81 babies die.

280 children are arrested for violent crimes.

443 babies are born to mothers who had late or no prenatal care.

781 babies are born at low birth weight.

1,403 babies are born to teen mothers.

1,827 babies are born without health insurance.

2,430 babies are born into poverty.

2,756 children drop out of high school every school day.

3,436 babies are born to unmarried mothers.

5,753 children are arrested.

8,470 children are reported abused or neglected.

11.3 million children are without health insurance

14.5 million children live in poverty (Children's Defense Fund, 1998, p. 1).

Appendix B

National Program for the Transformation of School Counseling

Present Focus	New Vision
Mental health providers	Academic/student achievement focus
Individual student's concerns/issues	Whole school and system concerns/issues
Clinical model focused on student deficits	Academic focus, building on student strengths
Service provider, 1-1 and small groups	Leader, planner, program developer
Primary focus on personal/social	Focus on academic counseling, learning and achievement, supporting student success
Ancillary support personnel	Integral members of educational teams
Loosely defined role and responsibility	Focused mission and role identification
Record keepers	Use of data to effect change
Sorters, selectors in course placement process	Advocates for inclusion in rigorous preparation for all--especially poor and minority youth
Work in isolation or with other counselors	Teaming and collaboration with all educators in school in resolving issues involving the whole school community
Guardians of the status quo	Agents for change, especially for educational equity for all students
Involvement primarily with students	Involvement with students, parents, educational professionals, community agencies

Little or no accountability	Accountable for student success, use of data, planning and preparation for access to wide range of post secondary options
Dependence on use of system's resources for helping students and families	Brokers of services for parents and students from community resources/agencies as well as school system's resources
Post secondary planners with interested students	Champions for creating pathways for all students to achieve high aspirations

(Guerra, 1998, p. 5).

Appendix C

As presented in the Georgia School Counselor Evaluation Program manual, the evaluation instrument consists of:

TASK I: Establishes and Promotes School Guidance and Counseling Program

Dimension A: Implements or Assists in Implementing the School-Based Guidance Plan

Subdimension 1:

Develops a written school-based guidance plan based on student needs

Subdimension 2:

Implements an individual plan of action

TASK II: Implements and Facilitates Delivery of Counseling Services

Dimension A: Coordinates Counseling with Students in Areas of Need

Subdimension 1:

Schedules time to provide opportunities for counseling

Subdimension 2:

Adheres to established system policies and procedures in scheduling appointments and obtaining parental permission

Dimension B: Conducts Individual Counseling with Students in Areas of Need

Subdimension 1:

Counsels students individually by actively listening, identifying and defining problem(s), discussing alternative solutions, and formulating a plan of action

Dimension C: Conducts Group Counseling with Students in Areas of Educational, Career, or Personal Needs

Subdimension 1:

Leads counseling and support groups for students experiencing similar problems

Subdimension 2:

Evaluates effectiveness of group counseling and makes revisions where necessary

TASK III: Implements and Facilitates Delivery of Guidance Services

Dimension A: Coordinates with School Staff to Provide Supportive Instructional Classroom Guidance Activities that Relate to Students' Educational, Career, and Personal Needs

Subdimension 1:
Collaborates with school staff in planning and scheduling classroom guidance activities
Subdimension 2:
Conducts or assists in conducting classroom guidance activities related to identified goals and objectives
Subdimension 3:
Gathers evaluative data to determine effectiveness of classroom guidance and student comprehension and makes revisions where necessary

Dimension B: Assists with Preparation of Students for and Interpretation of Standardized Group Testing
Subdimension 1:
Provides direct or indirect assistance to students preparing for test taking
Subdimension 2:
Provides information and interpretation to students, parents, or teachers on student test scores, if requested

Dimension C: Ensures that Students Receive Appropriate Career/Life (Educational or Occupational) Development Assistance
Subdimension 1:
Provides or assists in providing information to students and parents on career/life development
Subdimension 2:
Assists students with their transitions to the next career (educational/occupational) levels
Subdimension 3:
Leads skill-building groups in student self-improvement

TASK IV: Consults with School or System Staff, Parents, and Community

Dimension A: Consults with School or System Staff about Issues, Problems, and Concerns Involving Students, as Needed or Requested
Subdimension 1:
Exchanges relevant information about students or situations with school or system staff
Subdimension 2:
Develops with school staff a strategy or plan for improving the learning environment
Subdimension 3:
Follows up on counseling referrals and consultative sessions

Dimension B: Consults with Parents about Issues, Problems, and Concerns Involving Students, as Needed or Requested

Subdimension 1:

Consults with school and system staff in making referrals to community agencies

Subdimension 2:

Contacts, utilizes, and follows up on referrals made to community agencies (Georgia Department of Education, 1991, p. 15, 16).

Appendix D

GEORGIA SECONDARY SCHOOL COUNSELORS' TASKS SURVEY

– Principals–

Part I: In the center of this survey instrument is a partial listing of tasks performed by secondary school counselors. These tasks are listed by the American School Counselor Association's publication, Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs. Based on your current school counseling services, please circle the number to the left of each statement to rate the actual level of school counselor involvement in each task. On the right side of each statement, please circle the number that indicates your desired level of school counselor involvement in each task. Please rate the actual levels of involvement before rating the desired levels of involvement. Use the following rating scale:

1=No Involvement 3=Some Involvement 5=Total Involvement
2=Little Involvement 4=Much Involvement

Actual Involvement	Counselors' Tasks	Desired Involvement
1 2 3 4 5	Ensuring that student records are maintained as per state and federal legislation	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Performing disciplinary actions	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Assisting with duties in the principal's office	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Planning individual student's academic program	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Interpreting cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Maintaining student records	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Registering and scheduling of all new students	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Assisting the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Signing excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Teaching classes when teachers are absent	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Providing teachers with suggestions for better management of study halls	1 2 3 4 5

-OVER-

1=No Involvement 3=Some Involvement 5=Total Involvement
2=Little Involvement 4=Much Involvement

Actual Involvement	Counselors' Tasks	Desired Involvement
1 2 3 4 5	Keeping clerical records	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Counseling students who are tardy or absent	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Counseling students who have disciplinary problems	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Supervising study halls	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Computing grade point averages	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Counseling students as to appropriate school dress	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Interpreting student records	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Analyzing grade point averages in relation to achievement	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Sending students home who are not appropriately dressed	1 2 3 4 5

Part II: Please circle the appropriate letter or fill in the blank.

1. Your gender:
   a. Female
   b. Male

2. Your certification level
   a. 5 year
   b. 6 year
   c. 7 year

3. Your total years of administrative experience
   a. 0-10
   b. 11-20
   c. 21+

4. Counselor tasks in your school are determined by:
   a. School Principal
   b. Director of Guidance and Counseling
   c. Superintendent and the Board of Education

Thank you for your participation!

Appendix E

GEORGIA SECONDARY SCHOOL COUNSELORS' TASKS SURVEY

–Counselors–

Part I: In the center of this survey instrument is a partial listing of tasks performed by secondary school counselors. These tasks are listed in the American School Counselor Association's publication, Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs. Based on your current school counseling services, please circle the number to the left of each statement to rate your actual level of involvement in each task. On the right side of each statement, please circle the number that indicates your desired level of involvement in each task. Please rate the actual levels of involvement before rating the desired levels of involvement. Use the following rating scale:

1=No Involvement 3=Some Involvement 5=Total Involvement
2=Little Involvement 4=Much Involvement

Actual Involvement	Counselors' tasks	Desired Involvement
1 2 3 4 5	Ensuring that student records are maintained as per state and federal legislation	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Performing disciplinary actions	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Assisting with duties in the principal's office	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Planning individual student's academic program	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Interpreting cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Maintaining student records	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Registering and scheduling of all new students	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Assisting the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Signing excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Teaching classes when teachers are absent	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Providing teachers with suggestions for better management of study halls	1 2 3 4 5

-OVER-

1=No Involvement 3=Some Involvement 5=Total Involvement
2=Little Involvement 4=Much Involvement

Actual Involvement	Counselors' tasks	Desired Involvement
1 2 3 4 5	Keeping clerical records	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Counseling students who are tardy or absent	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Counseling students who have disciplinary problems	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Supervising study halls	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Computing grade point averages	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Counseling students as to appropriate school dress	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Interpreting student records	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Analyzing grade point averages in relation to achievement	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Sending students home who are not appropriately dressed	1 2 3 4 5

Part II: Please circle the appropriate letter or fill in the blank.

1. Your gender
   a. Female
   b. Male

2. Your certification level
   a. 5 year
   b. 6 year
   c. 7 year

3. Your total years of counseling experience
   a. 0-10
   b. 11-20
   c. 21+

4. Are you employed:
   a. Full time
   b. Part time

5. Counselor tasks in your school are determined by:
   a. School Principal
   b. Director of Guidance and Counseling
   c. Superintendent and Board of Education

Thank you for your participation!

Appendix F

504 Payne Place
Dublin, GA 31021
August 21, 1999

Dear Principal:

As a principal in a public secondary school in Georgia, you are aware of the needs of teenagers in today's society. As educators we know that these needs extend beyond our schools and into the homes and communities in which these young people live. Resources within and without the schools are available to provide teenagers with personal, social, educational, and career assistance. Secondary school counselors are examples of resources within schools.

This letter is a request for your assistance in gathering data for a doctoral research project. I am conducting a statewide study of secondary school principals and counselors regarding tasks performed by school counselors. I am including all public secondary schools in Georgia not considered by the Georgia Department of Education as special entity schools. I am seeking participation from every principal and all counselors in each of these schools. Accompanying this letter are: the survey instrument and a stamped, addressed envelope for your return of the instrument.

On the survey instrument, 22 counseling tasks are presented. The tasks represented here are only a partial listing of tasks performed by secondary school counselors. Delivery methods are not listed as tasks, but a variety of them may be used to accomplish the various tasks. You are asked to complete the survey indicating your opinion of actual and desired levels of involvement of your counselors in each activity. You are also asked to complete a short demographic section. The instrument for counselors is identical to the one for principals, with the exception of demographic differences. Please complete the front and back pages and return the survey to me in the stamped reply envelope by September 6, 1999.

The survey return envelope is coded for follow-up contact with schools only. You may be assured your responses are confidential. After receiving the responses, the coded envelope will be destroyed. There is no coding on the survey instrument. Your completion and return of the survey will be considered as permission by you to include your responses in the research data. There are no known risks for participating in this study. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant in this study, they should be directed to the IRB Coordinator at the Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs at (912)681-5465. If you desire a summary of the results of this study, please send your name and address to me in a separate envelope. Thank you very much for your assistance in contributing to this research project.

Respectfully,

Dorothy H. Hardy

Appendix G

504 Payne Place
Dublin, GA 31021
8/21/99

Dear Counselor:

As a counselor in a public secondary school in Georgia, you are aware of the needs of teenagers in today's society. As educators we know that these needs extend beyond our schools and into the homes and communities in which these young people live. Resources within and without the schools are available to provide teenagers with personal, social, educational, and career assistance. As secondary school counselors, you are examples of resources within schools.

This letter is a request for your assistance in gathering data for a doctoral research project. I am conducting a statewide study of secondary school principals and counselors regarding tasks performed by school counselors. I am including all public secondary schools in Georgia not considered by the Georgia Department of Education as special entity schools. I am seeking participation from every principal and all counselors in each of these schools. Accompanying this letter are: the survey instrument and a stamped, addressed envelope for your return of the instrument.

On the survey instrument, 22 counseling tasks are presented. The tasks represented here are only a partial listing of tasks performed by secondary school counselors. Delivery methods are not listed as tasks, but a variety of them may be used to accomplish the various tasks. You are being asked to complete the survey indicating your opinion of your actual and desired levels of involvement in each task area. You are also asked to complete a short demographic section. The instrument for principals is identical to the one for counselors, with the exception of demographic differences. Please complete the front and back pages and return the survey to me in the stamped reply envelope by September 6, 1999.

The survey return envelope is coded for follow-up contact with schools only. You may be assured your responses are confidential. After receiving the responses, the coded envelope will be destroyed. There is no coding on the survey instrument. Your completion and return of the survey will be considered as permission by you to include your responses in the research data. There are no known risks for participating in this study. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant in this study, they should be directed to the IRB Coordinator at the Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs at (912)681-5465. If you desire a summary of the results of this study, please send your name and address to me in a separate envelope. Thank you very much for your assistance in contributing to this research project.

Sincerely,

Dorothy H. Hardy

Appendix H

Office of Research Services & Sponsored Programs
Georgia Southern University

Institutional Review Board (IRB)
Memorandum

Phone: 681-5465 P.O. Box 8005 Fax: 681-0719
oversight@GaSoU.edu -- or -- ngarrets@GaSoU.edu

To: Dorothy Hardy
Educational Leadership

From: Neil Garretson, Coordinator
Research Oversight Committees (IACUC/IBC/IRB)

Date: May 3, 1999

Subject: Application for Approval to Utilize Human Subjects in Research

---

On behalf of Dr. Howard M. Kaplan, Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I am writing to inform you that we have completed the review of your *Application for Approval to Utilize Human Subjects* in your proposed research, "Tasks of Secondary School Counselors as Perceived by Public Secondary School Principals and Counselors in Georgia." It is the determination of the Chair, on behalf of the Institutional Review Board, that your proposed research adequately protects the rights of human subjects. Your research is approved in accordance with the *Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects* (45 CFR §46101(b)(2)), which states:

> (2) Research involving the use of ...survey procedures, interview procedures (as long as) (i) information obtained (either) is recorded in such a manner that human subjects ~~can~~ (cannot) be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects, ~~and~~ (or) (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could (not) reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

However, this approval is conditional upon the following revisions and/or additions being completed prior the collection of any data:

1. You will need to revise both the principal and counselor informed consent letters as follows. Replace the second to last sentence of the fourth paragraph (that begins with "If you have any questions or concerns...") with "If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant in this study, they should be directed to the IRB Coordinator at the Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs at (912)681-5465."

If you have any questions, comments, or concerns about these conditions of approval, please do not hesitate to contact the IRB Coordinator. Please send a copy of all revised and/or additional materials to the IRB Coordinator at the Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs (PO Box 8005).

This IRB approval is in effect for one year from the date of this letter. If at the end of that time, there have been no changes to the exempted research protocol, you may request an extension of the approval period for an additional year. Please notify the IRB Coordinator immediately if a change or modification of the approved methodology is necessary. Upon completion of your data collection, please notify the IRB Coordinator so that your file may be closed.

Cc: Dr. Patricia Lindauer, Faculty Advisor